arXiv:1110.6915v1 [math.DS] 31 Oct 2011

Minimal period problems for brake orbits of nonlinear autonomous reversible semipositive Hamiltonian systems

Duanzhi Zhang *

School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University
Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China

Abstract

In this paper, for any positive integer n, we study the Maslov-type index theory of i_{L_0}, i_{L_1} and $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}$ with $L_0=\{0\}\times\mathbf{R}^n\subset\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and $L_1=\mathbf{R}^n\times\{0\}\subset\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. As applications we study the minimal period problems for brake orbits of nonlinear autonomous reversible Hamiltonian systems. For first order nonlinear autonomous reversible Hamiltonian systems in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, which are semipositive, and superquadratic at zero and infinity we prove that for any $T>0$, the considered Hamiltonian systems possesses a nonconstant T periodic brake orbit X_T with minimal period no less than $\frac{T}{2n+2}$. Furthermore if $\int_0^T H''_{22}(x_T(t))dt$ is positive definite, then the minimal period of x_T belongs to $\{T,\ \frac{T}{2}\}$. Moreover, if the Hamiltonian system is even, we prove that for any $T>0$, the considered even semipositive Hamiltonian systems possesses a nonconstant symmetric brake orbit with minimal period belonging to $\{T,\ \frac{T}{3}\}$.

MSC(2000): 58E05; 70H05; 34C25

Key words: symmetric, brake orbit, semipositive and reversible, Maslov-type index, minimal period, Hamiltonian systems.

1 Introduction and main results

In this paper, let $J=\begin{pmatrix}0 & -I_n\\ I_n & 0\end{pmatrix}$ and $N=\begin{pmatrix}-I_n & 0\\ 0 & I_n\end{pmatrix}$, where I_n is the identity in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $n\in\mathbf{N}$. We suppose the following condition

---

*Partially supported by National Science Foundation of China (10801078, 11171314), LPMC of Nankai University.
E-mail: zhangdz@nankai.edu.cn

(H1) $H \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$ and satisfies the following reversible condition

$$H(Nx) = H(x), \qquad \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}.$$

We consider the following problem:

$$\dot{x} = JH'(x), \qquad x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}, \tag{1.1}$$

$$x(-t) = Nx(t), \;\; x(T+t) = x(t), \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{1.2}$$

A solution (T, x) of (1.1)-(1.2) is a special periodic solution of the Hamiltonian system (1.1). We call it a *brake orbit* and T the period of x. Moreover, if $x(\mathbf{R}) = -x(\mathbf{R})$, we call it a *symmetric brake orbit*. It is easy to check that if τ is the minimal period of x, there must holds $x(t + \frac{\tau}{2}) = -x(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$.

Since 1948, when H. Seifert in [47] proposed his famous conjecture of the existence of n geometrically different brake orbits in the potential well in $\mathbf{R}^n$ under certain conditions, many people began to study this conjecture and related problems. Let ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega)$ and ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)$ the number of geometrically distinct brake obits in Ω for the second order case and on Σ for the first order case respectively. S. Bolotin proved first in [7](also see [8]) of 1978 the existence of brake orbits in general setting. K. Hayashi in [27], H. Gluck and W. Ziller in [25], and V. Benci in [5] in 1983-1984 proved ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega) \geq 1$ if V is C^1, $\bar{\Omega} = \{V \leq h\}$ is compact, and $V'(q) \neq 0$ for all $q \in \partial\Omega$. In 1987, P. Rabinowitz in [45] proved that if H is C^1 and satisfies the reversible conditon, $\Sigma \equiv H^{-1}(h)$ is star-shaped, and $x \cdot H'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \Sigma$, then ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq 1$. In 1987, V. Benci and F. Giannoni gave a different proof of the existence of one brake orbit in [6].

In 1989, A. Szulkin in [49] proved that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(H^{-1}(h)) \geq n$, if H satisfies conditions in [43] of Rabinowitz and the energy hypersurface $H^{-1}(h)$ is $\sqrt{2}$-pinched. E. van Groesen in [26] of 1985 and A. Ambrosetti, V. Benci, Y. Long in [1] of 1993 also proved ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega) \geq n$ under different pinching conditions.

In [42] of 2006, Long , Zhu and the author of this paper proved that there exist at least 2 geometrically distinct brake orbits on any central symmetric strictly convex hypersuface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ for $n \geq 2$. Recently, in [35], Liu and the author of this paper proved that there exist at least $[n/2] + 1$ geometrically distinct brake orbits on any central symmetric strictly convex hypersuface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ for $n \geq 2$, if all brake orbits on Σ are nondegenerate then there are at least n geometrically distinct brake orbits on Σ. For more details one can refer to [42], [35] and the reference there in.

In his pioneering paper [43] of 1978, P. Rabinowitz proved the following famous result via the variational method. Suppose H satisfies the following conditions:

(H1′) $H \in C^1(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$.

(H2) There exist constants $\mu > 2$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 < \mu H(x) \leq H'(x) \cdot x, \quad \forall |x| \leq r_0.$$

(H3) $H(x) = o(|x|^2)$ at $x = 0$.

(H4) $H(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$.

Then for any $T > 0$, the system (1.1) possesses a non-constant T-periodic solution. Because a T/k periodic function is also a T-periodic function, in [43] Rabinowitz proposed a conjecture that *under conditions (H1′) and (H2)-(H4), there is a non-constant solution possessing any prescribed minimal period.* Since 1978, this conjecture has been deeply studied by many mathematicians. A significant progress was made by Ekeland and Hofer in their celebrated paper [16] of 1985, where they proved Rabinowitz's conjecture for the strictly convex Hamiltonian system. For Hamiltonian systems with convex or weak convex assumptions, we refer to [2]-[3], [12]-[13], [15]-[17], [41], [20]-[23], and references therein for more details. For the case without convex condition we refer to [37]-[39] and Chapter 13 of [41] and references therein. A interesting result is for the semipositive first order Hamiltonian system, in [18] G. Fei, S.-T. Kim, and T. Wang proved the existence of a T periodic solution of system (1.1) with minimal period no less than $T/2n$ for any given $T > 0$.

Note that in the second order Hamiltonian systems there are many results on the minimal problem of brake orbits such us [37]-[39] and [50]. For the even first order Hamiltonian system, in [51], the author of this paper studied the minimal period problem of semipositive even Hamiltonian system and gave a positive answer to Rabinowitz's conjecture in that case. In [19], G. Fei, S.-T. Kim, and T. Wang proved the same result for second order Hamiltonian systems.

So it is natural to consider the minimal period problem of brake orbits in reversible first order nonlinear Hamiltonian systems. In [32], Liu have considered the strictly convex reversible Hamiltonian systems case and proved the existence of nonconstant brake orbit of (1.1) with minimal period belonging to $\{T, T/2\}$ for any given $T > 0$.

Since [51], we also hope to obtain some interesting results in the even Hamiltonian system for the minimal period problem of brake orbits.

It can be found in many papers mentioned above that the Maslov-type index theory and its iteration theory play a important role in the study of minimal period problems in Hamiltonian systems. In this paper we study some monotonicity properties of Maslov-type index and apply it to prove our main results.

In this paper we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ the set of all real $2n\times 2n$ matrices and symmetric matrices respectively. And we denote by $y_1 \cdot y_2$ the usual inner product for all $y_1,\ y_2 \in \mathbf{R}^k$ with k being any positive integer. Also we denote by $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ the set of positive integers and integers respectively.

Let $\mathrm{Sp}(2n) = \{M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{2n}) | M^T JM = J\}$ be the $2n \times 2n$ real symplectic group. For any $\tau > 0$, Set $\mathcal{P}_\tau = \{\gamma \in C([0, \tau], \mathrm{Sp}(2n)) | \gamma(0) = I_{2n}\}$ and $S_\tau = \mathbf{R}/(\tau\mathbf{Z})$.

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, where $\mathbf{U}$ is the unit circle of the complex plane $\mathbf{C}$, the Maslov-type index $(i_\omega(\gamma), \nu_\omega(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, ...2n\}$ was defined by Long in [40]. We have a brief review in Appendix of Section 6.

For convenience to introduce our results, we define the following (**B1**) condition, since the Hamiltonian systems considered here are reversible, this condition is natural.

(B1) Condition. For any $\tau > 0$ and $B \in C([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ with the $n \times n$ matrix square block form $B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11}(t) & B_{12}(t) \\ B_{21}(t) & B_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix}$ satisfying $B_{12}(0) = B_{21}(0) = 0 = B_{12}(\tau) = B_{21}(\tau)$, We will call B satisfies the condition **(B1)**.

Throughout this paper, we denote by

$$L_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \subset \mathbf{R}^{2n}, \quad L_1 = \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{2n}. \tag{1.3}$$

The definitions of Maslov-type indices $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma), \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma))$ and $(i_{L_j}(\gamma), \nu_{L_j}(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ for $j = 0, 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ with $\tau > 0$ can be found in [42] and Section 2 below. Also for $B \in C([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ satisfies condition (B1), the definitions of $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B), \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B))$ and $(i_{L_j}(B), \nu_{L_j}(B)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ for $j = 0, 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ can be found in Section 2 and references therein.

For any $B \in C([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$, denote by γ_B the fundamental solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}_B(t) &= JB(t)\gamma_B(t), & (1.4) \\ \gamma_B(0) &= I_{2n}. & (1.5) \end{aligned}$$

Then $\gamma_B \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$. We call γ_B the *symplectic path associated* to B.

Definition 1.1. If $H \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$ is a reversible function, for any x_τ be a τ-periodic brake orbit solution of (1.1), let $B(t) = H''(x(t))$, we define $\gamma_{x_\tau} = \gamma_B|_{[0,\frac{\tau}{2}]}$ and call it the symplectic path associated to x_τ. We define

$$i_{L_0}(x_\tau) = i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}), \qquad \nu_{L_0}(x_\tau) = i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}). \tag{1.6}$$

Moreover, if H is even and x_τ is a τ-periodic symmetric brake orbit solution of (1.1), let $B(t) = H''(x(t))$, we define $\gamma_{x_\tau} = \gamma_B|_{[0,\frac{\tau}{4}]}$ and call it the symplectic path associated to x_τ. We define

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(x_\tau) = i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}), \qquad \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(x_\tau) = i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}). \tag{1.7}$$

Definition 1.2. For any τ-period and $k \in \mathbf{N} \equiv \{1, 2, ...\}$, we define the k times iteration x^k of x by

$$x^k(t) = x(t - j\tau), \quad j\tau \le t \le (j+1)\tau, \quad 0 \le j \le k. \tag{1.8}$$

As in [35], for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ and $k \in \mathbf{N} \equiv \{1, 2, ...\}$, in this paper the k-time iteration γ^k of $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ in brake orbit boundary sense is defined by $\tilde{\gamma}|_{[0,k\tau]}$ with

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t - 2j\tau)(N\gamma(\tau)^{-1}N\gamma(\tau))^j, \ t \in [2j\tau, (2j+1)\tau], j = 0, 1, 2, ... \\ N\gamma(2j\tau + 2\tau - t)N(N\gamma(\tau)^{-1}N\gamma(\tau))^{j+1} \ t \in [(2j+1)\tau, (2j+2)\tau], j = 0, 1, 2, ... \end{cases}$$

The followings are our main results of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H4) and*

(H5) $H''(x)$ is semipositive definite for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$.

Then for any $T > 0$, the system (1.1)-(1.2) possesses a nonconstant T periodic brake orbit solution x_T with minimal period no less that $\frac{T}{2n+2}$. Moreover, for $x = (x_1, x_2)$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n$, denote by $H''_{22}(x)$ the second order differential of H with respect to x_2, if

$$\int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} H''_{22}(x_T(t))\, dt > 0, \tag{1.9}$$

then the minimal period of x_T belongs to $\{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$.

Remark 1.1. (Theorem 1.1 of [32]) *Suppose that H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H4) and if x_T satisfies*

(H5′) $\int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} H''(X_T(t))\, dt > 0$.

Then the minimal period of x_T belongs to $\{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$.

In the case $n = 1$, the result can be better, i.e., the following

Theorem 1.2. *For $n = 1$, suppose that H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H4).*

Then for any $T > 0$, the system (1.1)-(1.2) possesses a nonconstant T periodic brake orbit solution with minimal period belong to $\{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$.

Consider the minimal period problem for $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}B_0 x \cdot x + \hat{H}(x)$, where $B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$. This is motivated by [18], [22], and [43], where in [18] B_0 was considered to be semipositive, in [22] and [43] B_0 was considered to be positive.

We have the following general result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* $2n \times 2n$ *be real semipositive matrix* $B_0 = \mathrm{diag}(B_{11}, B_{22})$ *with* B_{11} *and* B_{22} *being* $n \times n$ *matrix. Assume* $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}B_0 x \cdot x + \hat{H}(x)$ *for all* $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$*, and* $\hat{H}$ *satisfies conditions (H1)-(H5).*

Then for any $T > 0$*, (1.1) possesses a nonconstant* T*-periodic brake orbit* x_T *with minimal period no less than* $\frac{T}{2i_{L_0}(B_0)+2\nu_{L_0}(B_0)+2n+2}$*, where we see* B_0 *as an element in* $C([0,T/2], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *satisfies condition (B1).*

Remark 1.2. In section 3, we will show $i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) \geq 0$.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 1.3, we have the following Corollary 1.1.

Corollary 1.1. *For* $T > 0$ *such that* $i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) = 0$*, where we see* B_0 *as an element in* $C([0,T/2], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ *satisfies condition (B1), under the same assumptions of Theorem 1.2, the system (1.1) possesses a nonconstant* T*-periodic brake orbit with minimal period no less that* $\frac{T}{2n+2}$*.*

We can also prove the following Corollary 1.2 of Theorem 1.3.

Corollary 1.2. *If* $B_0 \neq 0$*, then for* $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{||B_0||}$ *with* $||B_0||$ *being the operator norm of* B_0*, under the same condition of Theorem 1.2, possesses a nonconstant* T*-periodic brake orbit* x_T *with minimal period no less than* $\frac{T}{2n+2}$*. Moreover , if*

$$\int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} H''_{22}(x_T(t))\,dt > 0,$$

then the minimal period of x_T *belongs to* $\{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$*.*

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that* H *satisfies conditions (H1)-(H5) and*

(H6) $H(-x) = H(x)$ *for all* $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$*.*

Then for any $T > 0$*, the system (1.1)-(1.2) possesses a nonconstant symmetric brake orbit with minimal period belonging to* $\{T, T/3\}$*.*

Theorem 1.5. *Let* $2n \times 2n$ *be real semipositive matrix* $B_0 = \mathrm{diag}(B_{11}, B_{22})$ *with* B_{11} *and* B_{22} *being* $n \times n$ *matrix, assume* $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}B_0 x \cdot x + \hat{H}(x)$ *for all* $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$*, and* $\hat{H}$ *satisfies conditions (H1)-(H6). Then for any* $T > 0$*, the system (1.1)-(1.2) possesses a nonconstant symmetric brake orbit* x_T *with minimal period no less than* $\frac{T}{4(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0))+7}$*. Moreover, if* $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)$ *is even, then the minimal period of* x_T *is no less than* $\frac{T}{4(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0))+3}$*where we see* B_0 *as an element in* $C([0,T/4], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ *satisfies condition (B1).*

Remark 1.3. In section 3, we will show that $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) \geq 0$, hence $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) \geq 0$.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 1.5, we have the following Corollary 1.3.

Corollary 1.3. *For* $T > 0$ *such that* $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) = 0$*, under the same assumptions of Theorem 1.4, the system (1.1) possesses a nonconstant symmetric brake orbit with minimal period belonging to* $\{T, T/3\}$*.*

We can also prove the following Corollary 1.4 of Theorem 1.5.

Corollary 1.4. *If $B_0 \neq 0$, then for $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{||B_0||}$ with $||B_0||$ being the operator norm of B_0, under the same condition of Theorem 1.5, the system (1.1) possesses a nonconstant symmetric brake orbit with minimal period belonging to $\{T, T/3\}$.*

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we study the Maslov-type index theory of i_{L_0}, i_{L_1} and $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}$. We compute the difference between $i_{L_0}(\gamma)$ and $i_{L_1}(\gamma)$. In Section 3, we study the relation between the Maslov-type index $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B), \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B))$ for $B \in C([0,\tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ satisfies condition (B1) and the Morse indices of the corresponding Galerkin approximation. As applications we get some monotonicity properties of $i_{L_0}(B)$, $i_{L_1}(B)$ and $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B)$ and we prove Theorem 3.2 which is very important in the proof of Theorems 1.4-1.5. In Section 4, based on the preparations in Sections 2 and 3 we prove Theorems 1.1-1.3 and Corollary 1.2. In Section 5, we prove Theorems 1.4-1.5 and corollary 1.4. In Section 6, we give a briefly review of (i_ω, ν_ω) index theory with $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ for symplectic paths starting with identity as appendix.

2 Maslov-type index theory associated with Lagrangian subspaces

2.1 A brief review of index function (i_{L_j}, ν_{L_j}) with $j = 0, 1$ and $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}, \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}})$

Let

$$F = \mathbf{R}^{2n} \oplus \mathbf{R}^{2n} \tag{2.1}$$

possess the standard inner product. We define the symplectic structure of F by

$$\{v, w\} = (\mathcal{J} v, w),\ \forall v, w \in F, \text{ where } \mathcal{J} = (-J) \oplus J = \begin{pmatrix} -J & 0 \\ 0 & J \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.2}$$

We denote by $\mathrm{Lag}(F)$ the set of Lagrangian subspaces of F, and equip it with the topology as a subspace of the Grassmannian of all $2n$-dimensional subspaces of F.

It is easy to check that, for any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ its graph

$$\mathrm{Gr}(M) \equiv \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ Mx \end{pmatrix} | x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \right\}$$

is a Lagrangian subspace of F.

Let

$$V_1 = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \subset \mathbf{R}^{4n}, \quad V_2 = \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{4n}. \tag{2.3}$$

By Proposition 6.1 of [35] and Lemma 2.8 and Definition 2.5 of [42], we give the following definition.

Definition 2.1. For any continuous path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, we define the following Maslov-type indices:

$$
\begin{aligned}
i_{L_0}(\gamma) &= \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n, &(2.4)\\
i_{L_1}(\gamma) &= \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n, &(2.5)\\
\nu_{L_j}(\gamma) &= \dim(\gamma(\tau)L_j \cap L_j), \qquad j = 0, 1, &(2.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we denote by $i_F^{CLM}(V, W, [a,b])$ the Maslov index for Lagrangian subspace path pair (V, W) in F on $[a,b]$ defined by Cappell, Lee, and Miller in [11].

For $\omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}$ with $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, we define a Hilbert space $E^\omega = E^\omega_{L_0}$ consisting of those $x(t)$ in $L^2([0,\tau], \mathbf{C}^{2n})$ such that $e^{-\theta t J}x(t)$ has Fourier expending

$$e^{-\frac{\theta t}{\tau}J}x(t) = \sum_{j\in\mathbf{Z}} e^{\frac{j\pi t}{\tau}J}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a_j \end{pmatrix},\ a_j \in \mathbf{C}^n$$

with

$$\|x\|^2 := \sum_{j\in\mathbf{Z}} \tau(1+|j|)|a_j|^2 < \infty.$$

For $\omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}$, $\theta \in (0,\pi)$, we define two self-adjoint operators $A^\omega, B^\omega \in \mathcal{L}(E^\omega)$ by

$$(A^\omega x, y) = \int_0^1 \langle -J\dot{x}(t), y(t)\rangle dt,\ \ (B^\omega x, y) = \int_0^1 \langle B(t)x(t), y(t)\rangle dt$$

on E^ω. Then B^ω is also compact.

Definition 2.2. We define the index function

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i_\omega^{L_0}(B) = I(A^\omega,\ \ A^\omega - B^\omega) \equiv -\mathrm{sf}\{A^\omega - sB^\omega, 0 \le s \le 1\},\\
&\nu_\omega^{L_0}(B) = m^0(A^\omega - B^\omega),\ \forall\, \omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta},\ \ \theta \in (0,\pi),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the definition of sf of spectral flow for the path of bounded self-adjoint linear operators one can refer to [53] and references their in.

By (3.21) of [35], we have

$$i_{L_0}(B) \le i_\omega^{L_0}(B) \le i_{L_0}(B) + n. \tag{2.7}$$

Lemma 2.1. *For $\omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}$ with $\theta \in (0,\pi)$, let $V_\omega = L_0 \times (e^{\theta J}L_0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{4n} \equiv F$. There holds*

$$i_\omega^{L_0}(B) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_\omega, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0,\tau]). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we can suppose the C^1 path $\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B)$ of Lagrangian subspaces intersects V_ω regularly (otherwise we can perturb it slightly with fixed endow points such that they intersects regularly and the index dose not change by the homotopy invariant property μ_F^{CLM}), where the definition of intersection form can be found in [46]. We denote by μ^{BF} the maslov index defined by Booss and Furutani in [9].

By the spectral flow formula of Theorem 5.1 in [9] or Theorem 1.5 of [10] (cf. also proof of Proposition 2.3 of [52]), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{sf}\{A^\omega sB^\omega, 0 \le s \le 1\} \\
= \;& \mu^{BF}(\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_\omega, [0,\tau]) \\
= \;& \mu^{BF}((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), (I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})V_\omega, [0,\tau]) \\
= \;& \mu^{BF}((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, [0,\tau]) \\
= \;& -m^-(-\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, 0)) + \sum_{0<t<\tau} \mathrm{sign}(-\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, t)) \\
& +m^+(-\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, \tau)) \\
= \;& -m^+(\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, 0)) - \sum_{0<t<\tau} \mathrm{sign}(\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, t)) \\
& +m^-(\Gamma((I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), V_1, \tau)) \\
= \;& -\mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, (I \oplus e^{-\sqrt{-1}\theta J})\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0,\tau]) \\
= \;& -\mu_F^{CLM}((I \oplus e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta J})V_1, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0,\tau]) \\
= \;& -\mu_F^{CLM}(V_\omega, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0,\tau]), \qquad (2.9)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the fourth equality we have used Theorem 2.1 in [9] and the property of index μ^{RS} for symplectic paths defined in [46](cf also (2.6)-(2.8) of [52]), in the sixth equality we have used Lemma 2.6 of [42], in the second and seventh equalities we used the symplectic invariance property of index μ^{BF} and μ_F^{CLM} respectively. ∎

Definition 2.3. Let $B \in C([0,\tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and γ_B be the symplectic path associated to B. We define

$$
i_\omega^{L_0}(\gamma_B) = i_\omega^{L_0}(B), \qquad (2.10)
$$

$$
\nu_\omega^{L_0}(\gamma_B) = \nu_\omega^{L_0}(B). \qquad (2.11)
$$

By Lemma 2.1, in general we give the following definition.

Definition 2.4. For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega = e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}$ with $\theta \in (0,\pi)$, we define

$$
i_\omega^{L_0}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_\omega, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0,\tau]),
$$

$$\nu_{\omega}^{L_0}(\gamma) = \dim\left(\gamma(\tau)L_0 \cap e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta J}L_0\right). \tag{2.12}$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, we define a new symplectic path $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ by

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \begin{cases} I_{2n}, \quad t \in [0, \frac{\tau}{3}], \\ \gamma(3t-\tau), \quad t \in [\frac{\tau}{3}, \frac{2\tau}{3}], \\ \gamma(\tau), \quad t \in [\frac{2\tau}{3}, \tau]. \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

So we can perturb $\tilde{\gamma}$ slightly to a C^1 path $\hat{\gamma}$ such that $\hat{\gamma}$ is homotopic to $\tilde{\gamma}$ with fixed end points and $\hat{\gamma}(t) = I_{2n}$ for $t \in [0, \frac{\tau}{6}]$ and $\hat{\gamma}(t) = \gamma(\tau)$ for $t \in [\frac{5\tau}{6}, \tau]$. Set $\hat{B}(t) = -J\dot{\hat{\gamma}}(t)(\hat{\gamma}(t))^{-1}$. So we have

$$\hat{B}(0) = \hat{B}(\tau) = 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Then this $\hat{B} \in C([0,\tau], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and satisfies condition (B1). Also we have $\hat{\gamma}$ is is homotopic to γ with fixed end points. So we have

$$i_1(\hat{\gamma}^k) = i_1(\gamma^k) = i_1(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\nu_1(\hat{\gamma}^k) = \nu_1(\gamma^k) = \nu_1(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N} \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$i_{L_0}(\hat{\gamma}^k) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\nu_{L_0}(\hat{\gamma}^k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{2.18}$$

Also by the property of index μ_F^{CLM} and Definition 2.4 have

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^k) = i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\hat{\gamma}^k) = i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N},$$
$$\nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^k) = \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\hat{\gamma}^k) = \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^k_{\hat{B}}), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Hence, in [35] the authors essentially proved the following Bott-type iteration formula.

Theorem 2.1. (Theorem 4.1 of [35]) *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega_k = e^{\pi\sqrt{-1}/k}$. For odd k we have*

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} i_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2),$$
$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} \nu_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2),$$

and for even k, we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{k/2-1} i_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2),$$
$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{k/2-1} \nu_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2).$$

Obviously we also have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) \leq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma) \leq i_{L_0}(\gamma) + n. \tag{2.19}$$

2.2 The Bott-type iteration formula for $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}, \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}})$

In order to study the minimal period problem for Even reversible Hamiltonian systems, we need the iteration formula of the Maslov-type index of $(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}, \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}})$ for symplectic paths starting with identity. We use Theorem 2.1 to obtain it.

Precisely we have the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega_k = e^{\pi\sqrt{-1}/k}$. For odd k we have*

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k) = i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} i_{\omega_k^{2i-1}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.20}$$

$$\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k) = \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} \nu_{\omega_k^{2i-1}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.21}$$

and for even k, we have

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k/2} i_{\omega_k^{2i-1}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.22}$$

$$\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k/2} \nu_{\omega_k^{2i-1}}(\gamma^2). \tag{2.23}$$

Proof. For odd k, since $\gamma^{2k} = (\gamma^k)^2$, by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^{2k}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^k) + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k), \tag{2.24}$$

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma^{2k}) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^k). \tag{2.25}$$

Also by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} i_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.26}$$

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \sum_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} \nu_{\omega_k^{2i}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.27}$$

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^{2k}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} i_{\omega_{2k}^{2i}}(\gamma^2), \tag{2.28}$$

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma^{2k}) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^1) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \nu_{\omega_{2k}^{2i}}(\gamma^2). \tag{2.29}$$

Since $\omega_k = \omega_{2k}^2$, by (2.24), (2.28) minus (2.26) yields (2.20). By (2.25), (2.29) minus (2.27) yields (2.21).

For even k, by similar argument we obtain (2.22) and (2.23). The proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete. ∎

2.3 The difference of $i_{L_0}(\gamma)$ and $i_{L_1}(\gamma)$.

The precise difference of $i_{L_0}(\gamma)$ and $i_{L_1}(\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ with $\tau > 0$ is very important in the proof of the main results of this paper. In this subsection we use the Hörmander index (cf. [14]) to compute it. Note that in [42], in fact we have already proved that $|i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma)| \leq n$.

For any $P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, we set

$$M_\varepsilon(P) = P^T \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix} P + \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.30}$$

Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ with $\tau > 0$, we have*

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)), \tag{2.31}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))$ is the signature of the symmetric matrix $M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small.

we also have,

$$(i_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma)) - (i_{L_1}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma)) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sign} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)), \tag{2.32}$$

where $\varepsilon < 0$ and $|\varepsilon|$ is sufficiently small.

Proof. By the first geometrical definition of the Maslov-type index in Section 4 of [11], there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$V_1 \cap e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0)) = \{0\}, \qquad V_2 \cap e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)) = \{0\}. \tag{2.33}$$

By definition 2.1, we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n, \tag{2.34}$$

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n. \tag{2.35}$$

Define $\gamma_1(t) = e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(t))$ and $\gamma_2(t) = e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}} \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau - t))$ for $t \in [0,\tau]$. Then γ_1 and γ_2 are two paths of Lagrangian subspaces of the symplectic space $(F, \mathcal{J})$ defined in (2.1) and (2.2). γ_1 connects

$e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0))$ and $e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau))$ and is transversal to V_1 and V_2. γ_2 connects $e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau))$ and $e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0))$ and is transversal to V_1 and V_2. Denote by γ the catenation of the paths γ_1 and γ_2. By Definition 3.4.2 of the *Hörmande index* $s(M_1, M_2; L_1, L_2)$ on p. 66 of [14] and (2.34)-(2.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & s(V_1, V_2; e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0)), e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau))) \\ = \ & \langle\gamma, \alpha\rangle \\ = \ & \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, \gamma_1) + \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, \gamma_2) \qquad (2.36) \\ = \ & \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma)) - \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma)) \qquad (2.37) \\ = \ & i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma), \qquad (2.38) \end{aligned}$$

where α is the Maslov-Arnold index defined in Theorem 3.4.9 on p. 64 of [14]. Since γ_1 and γ_2 are transversal to V_1 and V_2 (2.36) holds, (2.37) holds from the definition of γ_1 and γ_2.

In the proof of Theorem 3.3 of [42], we have proved that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there holds

$$\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(I_{2n}); V_2) = 0, \qquad (2.39)$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(W_1, W_3; W_2)$ for 3 Lagrangian spaces with W_3 transverses to W_1 and W_2 is introduced in Definition 3.2.3 on p. 67 of [14]. Note that by Claim 1 below, we can prove (2.39) at once.

Claim 1. For $\varepsilon > 0$, small enough, there holds

$$\mathrm{sign}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2) = \mathrm{sgn}(M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))). \qquad (2.40)$$

Proof of Claim 1. In fact,

$$e^{-\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{\varepsilon J} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\varepsilon J}\gamma(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \\ p \\ q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} cp - sq \\ sp + cq \\ (c,s)\gamma(\tau)(p,q)^T \\ (-s,c)\gamma(\tau)(p,q)^T \end{pmatrix}; \quad p, q \in \mathbf{R}^n \right\}, \qquad (2.41)$$

where we denote by $c = \cos\varepsilon I_n$ and $s = \sin\varepsilon I_n$. Hence the transformation $A : V_1 \mapsto e^{-\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(I_{2n})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & A(0, -sp - cq, 0, -(-s,c)\gamma(\tau)(p,q)^T) \\ & = (cp - sq, sp + cq, (c,s)\gamma(\tau)(p,q)^T, (-s,c)\gamma(\tau)(p,q)^T), \quad \forall p, q \in \mathbf{R}^n, \qquad (2.42) \end{aligned}$$

where A is introduced in Definition 3.4.3 of $\mathrm{sign}(M_1, M_2; L)$ on p. 67 of [14]. For the convenience of our computation, we rewrite (2.42) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & A\left(-\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ s & c \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, -\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} c & -s \\ s & c \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Then for $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in \mathbf{R}^n$, the symmetric bilinear form $Q(V_2) : (x, y) \mapsto \mathcal{J}(Ax, y)$ on V_1 defined in Definition 3.4.3 on p. 67 of [14] satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} & Q(V_2)\left(\left(-\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ s & c \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, -\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right)\right) \\ = \ & \left\langle ((-J)\oplus J)\left[\begin{pmatrix} c & -s \\ s & c \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right],\right. \\ & \left.\left[-\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ s & c \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, -\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right]\right\rangle. \\ = \ & \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & s \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} J \begin{pmatrix} c & -s \\ s & c \end{pmatrix} - \gamma(\tau)^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -s \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} J \begin{pmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\right]\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle. \\ = \ & \left\langle \left[\begin{pmatrix} sc & -s^2 \\ c^2 & -sc \end{pmatrix} + \gamma(\tau)^T \begin{pmatrix} sc & s^2 \\ -c^2 & -sc \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)\right]\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

Let $\tilde{M}_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = \begin{pmatrix} sc & -s^2 \\ c^2 & -sc \end{pmatrix} + \gamma(\tau)^T \begin{pmatrix} sc & s^2 \\ -c^2 & -sc \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau)$. Then by definition of the symmetric bilinear form $Q(V_2)$, $\tilde{M}_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)$ is an invertible symmetric $2n \times 2n$ matrix. We define

$$M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = 2\tilde{M}_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = \tilde{M}_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) + \tilde{M}_\varepsilon^T(\gamma(\tau)). \tag{2.45}$$

Then we have

$$M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = \gamma(\tau)^T \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix}\gamma(\tau) + \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.46}$$

It is clear that

$$\mathrm{sgn} Q(V_2) = \mathrm{sgn}\tilde{M}_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)). \tag{2.47}$$

By the definition of $\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2)$, we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2) = \mathrm{sgn} Q(V_2). \tag{2.48}$$

Then (2.40) holds from (2.47) and (2.48), and the proof of Claim 1 is complete.

Thus by (2.38), (2.39) and Claim 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma) \\ = \; & s(V_1, V_2; e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0)), e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau))) \\ = \; & \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(0)); V_2) \\ = \; & \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2) - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(I_{2n}); V_2) \\ = \; & \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma(\tau)); V_2) \\ = \; & \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Here in the second equality, we have used Theorem 3.4.12 of on p. 68 of [14]. Thus (2.31) holds.

Choose $\varepsilon < 0$ such that $|\varepsilon|$ is sufficiently small, by the discussion of μ_F^{CLM} index we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma), \tag{2.49}$$

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - \nu_{L_1}(\gamma). \tag{2.50}$$

Then by the same proof as above, we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma) - \nu_{L_1}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)), \tag{2.51}$$

where $\varepsilon < 0$ is small enough. Hence (2.32) holds. The proof of Theorem 2.3 is complete. ∎

We have the following consequence.

Corollary 2.1. (Theorem 2.3 of [35]) *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ with $\tau > 0$, there hold*

$$|i_{L_0}(\gamma)) - i_{L_1}(\gamma))| \le n, \quad |i_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma) - \nu_{L_1}(\gamma)| \le n. \tag{2.52}$$

Moreover if $\gamma(1)$ is a orthogonal matrix then there holds

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) = i_{L_1}(\gamma). \tag{2.53}$$

Proof. (2.52) holds directly from Theorem 2.3, so we only need to prove (2.53). Since $\gamma(\tau)$ is an orthogonal and symplectic matrix, we have

$$\gamma^T(\tau)J\gamma(\tau) = J, \quad \gamma^T(\tau)\gamma(\tau) = I_{2n}. \tag{2.54}$$

So we have

$$\gamma(\tau)J = J\gamma(\tau), \quad \gamma(\tau)^T J = J\gamma(\tau)^T. \tag{2.55}$$

It is easy to check that for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, there holds

$$J\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \pm\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \pm\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)J = \left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \pm\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \pm\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right). \tag{2.56}$$

Hence by (2.55) and (2.56), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
JM_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))J &= J\left[\gamma(\tau)^T\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)\gamma(\tau) + \left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)\right]J \\
&= J\gamma(\tau)^T\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)\gamma(\tau)J + J\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)J \\
&= \gamma(\tau)^T J\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)J\gamma(\tau) + J\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)J \\
&= \gamma(\tau)^T\left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right)\gamma(\tau) + \left(\begin{array}{cc}\sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n\end{array}\right) \\
&= M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

So we have

$$M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))J = -JM_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)). \tag{2.58}$$

Thus for any $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfying

$$M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))x = \lambda x. \tag{2.59}$$

By (2.58) we have

$$M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))(Jx) = -JM_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))x = -\lambda(Jx). \tag{2.60}$$

Since for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough $M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))$ is an invertible symmetric matrix, by (2.60) we have

$$m^+(M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))) = m^-(M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))) = n \tag{2.61}$$

which yields

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)) = m^+(M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))) - m^-(M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))) = 0. \tag{2.62}$$

Then (2.53) holds from Theorem 2.3. ∎

Lemma 2.2. *For a symplectic path $P : [0,\tau] \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\tau > 0$, if for $j = 0, 1$ there holds $\nu_{L_j}(P(t)) =$ constant for all $t \in [0,\tau]$, then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we have*

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P(0)) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P(\tau)). \tag{2.63}$$

Proof. Since $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ is path connected, we can choose a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ with $\gamma(\tau) = P(0)$. By Proposition 2.11 of [42] and the definition of μ_j for $j = 1, 2$ in [42], we have

$$\mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(P), [0,\tau]) = 0, \qquad j = 0, 1. \tag{2.64}$$

So by the Path Additivity and Reparametrization Invariance properties of μ_F^{CLM} in [11], we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{L_j}(P * \gamma) &= \mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(P*\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n \\ &= \mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) + \mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(P), [0,\tau]) - n \\ &= \mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n \\ &= i_{L_j}(\gamma), \end{aligned} \tag{2.65}$$

where the definition of joint path $\eta * \xi$ is given by (6.1) in Section 6 below. Then by Theorem 2.3 we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(M_\varepsilon(P(0))), \tag{2.66}$$

$$i_{L_0}(P*\gamma) - i_{L_1}(P*\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}(M_\varepsilon(P(\tau))). \tag{2.67}$$

Then (2.63) holds from (2.65)-(2.67). The proof of Lemma 2.2 is complete. ∎

Remark 2.1. *It is easy to check that for $n_j \times n_j$ symplectic matrix P_j with $j = 1, 2$ and $n_j \in \mathbf{N}$, we have*

$$M_\varepsilon(P_1 \diamond P_2) = M_\varepsilon(P_1) \diamond M_\varepsilon(P_2),$$

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1 \diamond P_2) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1) + \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_2).$$

By direct computation according to Theorem 2.3 and Corollary 2.1, for $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2)$, $b > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(R(\theta)) = 0, \quad \text{for } \theta \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{2.68}$$

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P) = 0, \quad \text{if } P = \pm\begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \pm\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -b & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.69}$$

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P) = 2, \quad \text{if } P = \pm\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.70}$$

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P) = -2, \quad \text{if } P = \pm\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ b & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.71}$$

Also we give a example as follows to finish this section

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P) = 2, \quad \text{if } P = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.72}$$

3 Relation between i_{L_0}, i_{L_1}, $i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}$ and the corresponding Morse indices, and their monotonicity properties.

In [31], Liu studied the relation between the L-index of solutions of Hamiltonian systems with L-boundary conditions and the Morse index of the corresponding functional defined via the Galerkin approximation method on the finite dimensional truncated space at its corresponding critical points. In order to prove the main results of this paper, in this section we use the results of [31] to study some monotonicity properties of i_{L_0} and i_{L_1}. We also study the index $i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B)$ with B being a continuous symmetric matrices path satisfying condition (B1) defined in Section 1 and the Morse index of the corresponding functional defined via the Galerkin approximation method. Then as applications we study some monotonicity properties of $i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B)$ which will be important in the proof of Theorems 1.4-1.5 in Section 5 below.

For any $\tau > 0$ and $B \in C([0,\tau/4], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ (in order to apply the results in this section conveniently Section 5, we always assume $B \in C([0,\tau/4], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ satisfying condition (B1). We extend B to $[0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$ by

$$B(\frac{\tau}{4}+t) = NB(\frac{\tau}{4}-t)N, \; \forall t \in [0, \frac{\tau}{4}]. \tag{3.1}$$

Then since $B(\frac{\tau}{2}) = B(0)$, we can extend it $\frac{\tau}{2}$-periodically to $\mathbf{R}$, so we can see B as an element in $C(S_{\tau/2}, \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$.

Let $E_\tau = \{x \in W^{1/2,2}(S_\tau, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) | \, x(-t) = Nx(t) \; a.e. \; t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ with the usual norm and inner product denoted by $||\cdot||$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle$ respectively.

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, for any $s \in [1, +\infty)$, there is a constant $C_s > 0$ such that

$$||z||_{L^s} \le C_s ||z||, \quad \forall z \in E_{2\tau}. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that B can also be seen as an element in $C(S_\tau, \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$. We define two selfadjoint operators A_τ and B_τ on E_τ by the following bilinear forms

$$\langle A_\tau x, y\rangle = \int_0^\tau -J\dot{x} \cdot y \, dt, \qquad \langle B_\tau x, y\rangle = \int_0^\tau B(t)x \cdot y \, dt. \tag{3.3}$$

Then A_τ is a bounded operator on E_τ and $\dim\ker A_\tau = n$, the Fredholm index of A_τ is zero, and B_τ is a compact operator on E_τ.

Set

$$E_\tau(j) = \left\{ z \in E_\tau \,\middle|\, z(t) = \exp(\frac{2j\pi t}{\tau}J)a + \exp(-\frac{2j\pi t}{\tau}J)b,\ \forall t \in \mathbf{R};\ \forall a,\, b \in L_0 \right\}.$$

and

$$E_{\tau,m} = E_\tau(0) + E_\tau(1) + \cdots + E_\tau(m).$$

Let $\Gamma_\tau = \{P_{\tau,m} : m = 0, 1, 2, ...\}$ be the usual Galerkin approximation scheme w.r.t. A_τ, just as in [31], i.e., Γ_τ is a sequence of orthogonal projections satisfies:

(1) $E_{\tau,0} = P_{\tau,0}E_\tau = \ker A_\tau,\ E_{\tau,m} = P_{\tau,m}E_\tau$ is finite dimension for $m \geq 0$;

(2) $P_{\tau,m} \to x$ as $m \to \infty$ for any $x \in E_\tau$;

(3) $P_{\tau,m}A_\tau = A_\tau P_{\tau,m}$, $\forall m \geq 0$.

For $d > 0$, we denote by $M_d^+(\cdot)$, $M_d^-(\cdot)$ and $M_d^0(\cdot)$ the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalue λ belong to $[d, +\infty)$, $(-\infty, -d]$ and $(-d, d)$ respectively, and $M^+(\cdot)$, $M^-(\cdot)$ and $M^0(\cdot)$ the positive, negative and null subspace of of the selfadjoint operator defining it respectively. For any bounded selfadjoint linear operator on E, We denote $L^\# = (L|_{ImL})^{-1}$, and we also denote by $P_{\tau,m}LP_{\tau,m} = (P_{\tau,m}LP_{\tau,m})|_{E_{\tau,m}} : E_{\tau,m} \to E_{\tau,m}$.

Similarly we define two subspaces of E_τ by $\hat{E} = \{x \in E | x(t + \frac{\tau}{2}) = -x(t), a.e.\, t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ and $\tilde{E} = \{x \in E | x(t + \frac{\tau}{2}) = x(t), a.e.\, t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ be the symmetric ones and $\frac{\tau}{2}$-periodic ones of E_τ respectively.

We define two selfadjoint operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ on $\hat{E}$ by the following bilinear forms

$$\langle \hat{A}x, y\rangle = \int_0^\tau -J\dot{x} \cdot y\, dt, \qquad \langle \hat{B}x, y\rangle = \int_0^\tau B(t)x(t) \cdot y(t)\, dt. \tag{3.4}$$

Then $\hat{A}$ is a bounded Fredholm operator on $\hat{E}$ and $\dim\ker \hat{A} = 0$, the Fredholm index of $\hat{A}$ is zero. $\hat{B}$ is a compact operator on $\hat{E}$.

For any positive integer m, we define

$$\hat{E}_m = \Sigma_{j=1}^m E_\tau(2j-1).$$

For $m \geq 1$, let $\hat{P}_m$ be the orthogonal projection from $\hat{E}$ to $\hat{E}_m$. Then $\{\hat{P}_m\}$ is a Galerkin approximation scheme w.r.t. $\hat{A}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For any* $B(t) \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *satisfying condition (B1) and* $0 < d \le \frac{1}{4}||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}$*, there exists* $m^* > 0$ *such that for* $m \ge m^*$ *there hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= mn - i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B) - \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B), && (3.5)\\ \dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= mn + i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B), && (3.6)\\ \dim M_d^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B). && (3.7)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The method of the proof here is similar as that of Theorem 2.1 in [51].

For any positive integer m, we define

$$\tilde{E}_m = \sum_{j=0}^{m} E_\tau(2j).$$

For $m \ge 1$, let $\tilde{P}_m$ be the orthogonal projection from $\tilde{E}$ to $\tilde{E}_m$. Then $\{\tilde{P}_m\}$ is a Galerkin approximation scheme w.r.t. $\tilde{A}$.

For any $y \in \hat{E}_m$ and $z \in \tilde{E}_m$, it is easy to check that

$$\langle (P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}y, z) \rangle = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

So we have the following $P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}$ orthogonal decomposition

$$E_{\tau,2m} = \hat{E}_m \oplus \tilde{E}_m. \tag{3.9}$$

Similarly, we have the following $A_\tau - B_\tau$ orthogonal decomposition

$$E_\tau = \hat{E} \oplus \tilde{E}. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, under above decomposition we have

$$(A_\tau - B_\tau) = (\hat{A} - \hat{B}) \oplus (\tilde{A} - \tilde{B}). \tag{3.11}$$

Thus

$$||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1} \le ||(\hat{A} - \hat{B})^{\#}||^{-1} \tag{3.12}$$

$$||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1} \le ||(\tilde{A} - \tilde{B})^{\#}||^{-1} \tag{3.13}$$

By the definitions of $M_d^*(\cdot)$ for $P_{\tau,2m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,2m}$, $\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m$, and $\tilde{P}_m(\tilde{A} - \tilde{B})\tilde{P}_m$ with $* = +, -, 0$. So for $* \in \{+, -, 0\}$ we have

$$\dim M_d^*(P_{\tau,2m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,2m}) = \dim M_d^*(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) + \dim M_d^*(\tilde{P}_m(\tilde{A} - \tilde{B})\tilde{P}_m). \tag{3.14}$$

Note that, the space E_τ and the operators A_τ, B_τ and $P_{\tau,m}$ are also defined in the same way. So by the definition we see that $\tilde{E}$ is the τ-periodic extending of E_τ from S_τ to $S_{2\tau}$, and $\tilde{E}_m$ is the τ-periodic extending of $E_{\tau,2m}$ from S_τ to $S_{2\tau}$ too.

Thus we have

$$||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1} = ||(\tilde{A} - \tilde{B})^{\#}||^{-1}. \tag{3.15}$$

By (3.13) and (3.15) we have

$$||(A_{2\tau} - B_{2\tau})^{\#}||^{-1} \le ||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}. \tag{3.16}$$

For $* \in \{+, -, 0\}$ we have

$$\dim M_d^*(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) = M_d^*(\tilde{P}_m(\tilde{A} - \tilde{B})\tilde{P}_m). \tag{3.17}$$

Then for $0 < d \le \frac{1}{4}||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}$, by Theorem 2.1 in [31] there exists $m_1 > 0$ such that for $m \ge m_1$ we have

$$\dim M_d^+(P_{\tau,2m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,2m}) = 2mn - i_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2), \tag{3.18}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(P_{\tau,2m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,2m}) = 2mn + n + i_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2), \tag{3.19}$$

$$\dim M_d^0(P_{\tau,2m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,2m}) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2). \tag{3.20}$$

By (3.16), we have $0 < d \le \frac{1}{4}||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}$. By Theorem 2.1 in [31] again there exists $m_2 > 0$, such that for $m \ge m_2$ we have

$$\dim M_d^+(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) = mn - i_{L_0}(\gamma_B) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B)), \tag{3.21}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) = mn + n + i_{L_0}(\gamma_B)), \tag{3.22}$$

$$\dim M_d^0(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B)). \tag{3.23}$$

Let $m^* = \max\{m_1, m_2\}$. Then for $m \ge m^*$, all of (3.18)-(3.23) hold.

So by (3.14), (3.17), and (3.18)-(3.23) we have

$$\dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) = mn - (i_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2) - i_{L_0}(\gamma_B)) - (\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B)), \tag{3.24}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) = mn + i_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2) - i_{L_0}(\gamma_B), \tag{3.25}$$

$$\dim M_d^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B^2) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_B). \tag{3.26}$$

Thus (3.5)-(3.7) hold from (3.24)-(3.26), Definition 2.3, and Theorem 2.2. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete. ∎

Remark 3.1. *Let any* $B \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *be a constant matrix path satisfying condition (B1). By Theorem 5.1 of [42], for* $d = 0$ *the same conclusions of Theorem 2.1 of [31] still holds . Hence for* $d = 0$ *the same conclusions of Theorem 3.1 still hold, i.e., there exists* $m^* > 0$ *such that for* $m \geq m^*$ *there hold*

$$\begin{aligned}\dim M^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= mn - i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B) - \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B),\\ \dim M^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= mn + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B),\\ \dim M^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B})\hat{P}_m) &= \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B).\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we study some monotonicity of the the Maslov-type $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}$ index. In this paper, for any two symmetric matrices B_1 and B_2, we say $B_1 > B_2$ if $B_1 - B_2$ is positive definite and we say $B_1 \geq B_2$ if $B_1 - B_2$ is semipositive. Similarly for two symmetric matrix paths B_1, $B_2 \in C([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}_s(R^{2n}))$, we say $B_1 > B_2$ if $B_1(t) - B_2(t)$ is positive definite for all $t \in [0, \tau]$ and we say $B_1 \geq B_2$ if $B_1(t) - B_2(t)$ is semipositive definite for all $t \in [0, \tau]$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any* $\tau > 0$ *and* B_1, $B_2 \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *satisfying condition (B1). If* $B_1 \geq B_2$, *then there hold*

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1) \geq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_2) \tag{3.27}$$

and

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1) \geq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_2) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_2). \tag{3.28}$$

Moreover, if

$$\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{4}} (B_1(t) - B_2(t))dt > 0, \tag{3.29}$$

then there holds

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1) \geq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_2) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_2). \tag{3.30}$$

Proof. Let the space $\hat{E}$ and the orthogonal projection operator $\hat{P}_m$ be the ones defined in Section 2. Correspondingly we define the compact operators $\hat{B}_1$ and $\hat{B}_2$. By Theorem 3.1, for $d > 0$ small enough, there exists $m^* > 0$ such that

$$\dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) = mn - i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1) - \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1), \tag{3.31}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) = mn + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1), \tag{3.32}$$

$$\dim M_d^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) = \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_1). \tag{3.33}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m) &= mn - i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_2) - \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_2), &(3.34)\\ \dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m) &= mn + i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_2), &(3.35)\\ \dim M_d^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m) &= \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_2). &(3.36)\end{aligned}$$

If $B_1 \geq B_2$, we have $\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m \leq \hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m$, So

$$\dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) \geq \dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m). \tag{3.37}$$

Then by (3.32) and (3.35), (3.27) holds. Also we have

$$\dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) \leq \dim M_d^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m). \tag{3.38}$$

Then by (3.31) and (3.34), (3.28) holds.

If $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{4}}(B_1(t)-B_2(t))dt > 0$, then

$$\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m < \hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m. \tag{3.39}$$

So we have

$$\dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_1)\hat{P}_m) \geq \dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m) + M_d^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A}-\hat{B}_2)\hat{P}_m). \tag{3.40}$$

Then by (3.32), (3.35) and (3.36), (3.30) holds and the proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete. ∎

Corollary 3.1. *For any $\tau > 0$ and $B \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ satisfying condition (B1) and $B \geq 0$, there holds*

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B) \geq 0. \tag{3.41}$$

proof. By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B) \geq i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0). \tag{3.42}$$

Then the conclusion holds from the fact that

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0) = i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_0) = 0, \tag{3.43}$$

Where γ_0 is the identity symplectic path. ∎

By Theorem 2.1 of [31] and the Remark below Theorem 2.1 in [31] and the similar proof of Lemma 3.1 we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\tau > 0$ and $B_1,\ B_2 \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ satisfying condition (B1) and $B_1 \geq B_2$, then for $j = 0, 1$ there hold*

$$i_{L_j}(B_1) \geq i_{L_j}(B_2) \tag{3.44}$$

and

$$i_{L_j}(B_1)+\nu_{L_j}(B_1)\geq i_{L_j}(B_2)+\nu_{L_j}(B_2). \tag{3.45}$$

Moreover, if $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{4}}(B_1(t)-B_2(t))dt>0$, *then there holds*

$$i_{L_j}(B_1)\geq i_{L_j}(B_2)+\nu_{L_j}(B_2). \tag{3.46}$$

Since $i_{L_j}(0)=-n$ and $\nu_{L_j}(0)=n$ for $j=0,1$, a direct consequence of Lemma 3.2 is the following

Corollary 3.2. *If* $\tau>0$ *and* $B\in C([0,\frac{\tau}{2}],\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *satisfying condition (B1) and* $B\geq 0$, *then for* $j=0,1$ *there hold*

$$i_{L_j}(B)+\nu_{L_j}(B)\geq 0, \qquad i_{L_j}(B)\geq -n. \tag{3.47}$$

Moreover if $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{2}}B(t)dt>0$, *there holds*

$$i_{L_j}(B)\geq 0. \tag{3.48}$$

Moreover we can give a stronger version of Corollary 3.2, i.e., the following Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $\tau>0$ *and* $B\in C([0,\frac{\tau}{2}],\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ *with the* $n\times n$ *matrix square block form* $B(t)=\begin{pmatrix}B_{11}(t) & B_{12}(t)\\ B_{21}(t) & B_{22}(t)\end{pmatrix}$ *satisfying condition (B1) and* $B\geq 0$.

If $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{2}}B_{22}(t)dt>0$, *there holds*

$$i_{L_0}(B)\geq 0. \tag{3.49}$$

If $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{2}}B_{11}(t)dt>0$, *there holds*

$$i_{L_1}(B)\geq 0. \tag{3.50}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\lambda>0$ such that

$$\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{2}}B_{22}(t)\geq\lambda I_n. \tag{3.51}$$

Also we can extend B to $[0,\tau]$ by

$$B(\frac{\tau}{2}+t)=NB(\frac{\tau}{2}-t)N,\ \forall t\in[0,\frac{\tau}{2}]. \tag{3.52}$$

Then since $B(\tau)=B(0)$, we can extend it τ-periodically to $\mathbf{R}$, so we can see B as an element in $C(S_\tau,\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$. Then we have

$$\int_0^{\tau}B_{22}(t)\geq 2\lambda I_n. \tag{3.53}$$

For any $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we define two subspaces of E as follows

$$E_{\tau,m}^{-} = \left\{ z \in E_\tau \left| z(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \exp(-\frac{2j\pi t}{\tau} J) b_j, \ \forall t \in \mathbf{R}; \ \forall b_j \in L_0 \right. \right\},$$

$$E_\tau(0) = \{ z \in E_\tau \, | z(t) \equiv b, \ b \in L_0 \} .$$

Then for any $z = \alpha x + \beta y \in E_\tau(0) \oplus E_{\tau,m}^{-}$ with $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$ and $||x|| = ||y|| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (A_\tau - B_\tau) z, z \rangle &= \langle (A_\tau - B_\tau)(\alpha x + \beta y), \alpha x + \beta y \rangle \\ &= -\beta^2 \langle A_\tau y, y \rangle - \langle B_\tau(\alpha x + \beta y), \alpha x + \beta y \rangle \\ &\leq -||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1} \beta^2 - \langle B_\tau(\alpha x + \beta y), \alpha x + \beta y \rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

Since $B \geq 0$, note that $x(t) \equiv b = (0, b_1) \in L_0$ for all $t \in S_\tau$ with $\tau |b_1|^2 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle B_\tau(\alpha x + \beta y), \alpha x + \beta y \rangle \\ = &\int_0^\tau (\alpha^2 Bx \cdot x + \beta^2 By \cdot y + 2\alpha\beta Bx \cdot y)\, dt \\ \geq &\alpha^2 \int_0^\tau Bx \cdot x\, dt + \beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt - 2|\alpha||\beta| (\int_0^\tau Bx \cdot x\, dt)^{1/2} (\int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt)^{1/2} \\ \geq &\alpha^2 \int_0^\tau Bx \cdot x\, dt + \beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt - \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \alpha^2 \int_0^\tau Bx \cdot x\, dt - (1+\varepsilon)\beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt \\ = &\frac{\varepsilon \alpha^2}{1+\varepsilon} \int_0^\tau Bx \cdot x\, dt - \varepsilon \beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt \\ = &\frac{\varepsilon \alpha^2}{1+\varepsilon} \left(\int_0^\tau B(t) dt \right) b \cdot b - \varepsilon \beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt \\ = &\frac{\varepsilon \alpha^2}{1+\varepsilon} \left(\int_0^\tau B_{22}(t) dt \right) b_1 \cdot b_1 - \varepsilon \beta^2 \int_0^\tau By \cdot y\, dt \\ \geq &\frac{\varepsilon \alpha^2}{1+\varepsilon} 2\lambda |b_1|^2 - \varepsilon \beta^2 ||B_\tau||\, ||y||^2 \\ = &\frac{2\varepsilon \lambda \alpha^2}{(1+\varepsilon)\tau} - \varepsilon \beta^2 ||B_\tau|| \end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let $\varepsilon = \min\{1, \frac{||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1} ||B_\tau||^{-1}}{2}\}$. By (3.54) and (3.55), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (A_\tau - B_\tau) z, z \rangle &\leq -||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1} \beta^2 - \frac{2\varepsilon \lambda \alpha^2}{(1+\varepsilon)\tau} + \varepsilon \beta^2 ||B_\tau|| \\ &\leq -\frac{||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1} \beta^2}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon \lambda \alpha^2}{\tau} \\ &\leq -d_0(\alpha^2 + \beta^2) \\ &= -d_0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

where $d_0 = \min\{\frac{||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon\lambda}{\tau}\} = \min\{\frac{||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}}{2}, \frac{\lambda}{\tau}, \frac{\lambda||A_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}||B_\tau||^{-1}}{2\tau}\}$. Note that d_0 is independent of m, so for $0 < d \leq \min\{d_0, \frac{||(A_\tau - B_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}}{4}\}$, by Theorem 2.1 of [31] there exists $m^* > 0$ such that, for $m \geq m^*$, we have

$$\dim M_d^-(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) = mn + n + i_{L_0}(B). \tag{3.57}$$

By (3.56) we have

$$\dim M_d^-(P_{\tau,m}(A_\tau - B_\tau)P_{\tau,m}) \geq \dim(E_\tau(0) \oplus E_{\tau,m}^-) = mn + n. \tag{3.58}$$

Then by (3.57) and (3.58) we have $i_{L_0}(B) \geq 0$.

For $\int_0^{\frac{\tau}{2}} B_{11}(t)dt > 0$, by similar proof we have $i_{L_1}(B) \geq 0$. The proof of Lemma 3.3 is complete.

∎

Now we give the following Theorem 3.2 which will play a important role in the proof of our main results in Section 5. This results implies that the corresponding Maslov-type index of a periodic symmetric solution of a first order even semipositive Hamilton increases with the increasing of the iteration time of the solution.

Theorem 3.2. *If $\tau > 0$ and $B \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ satisfying condition (B1) and $B \geq 0$, then for any two positive integers $p > q$ there holds*

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_B^p) \geq i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_B^q). \tag{3.59}$$

Proof. Extend $\gamma_B(t)$ to $[0, \frac{p\tau}{4}]$ as γ_B^p, we still denote it by γ_B. By definition of $i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_o}$ and the Path additivity and Symplectic invariance property of μ_F^{CLM} in [11], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_B^p) - i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_B^q) \\
= \;& \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times JL_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) - \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times JL_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [0, \frac{q\tau}{4}]) \\
= \;& \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times JL_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B), [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) \\
= \;& \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(-J\gamma_B), [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

By the first geometrical definition of the index μ_F^{CLM} in section 4 of [11], there is a $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$(e^{-\varepsilon\mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(-J\gamma_B(\frac{p\tau}{4})) \cap (L_0 \times L_0) = \{0\} = (e^{-\varepsilon J}\mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_B(\frac{q\tau}{4})) \cap (L_0 \times L_0) \tag{3.61}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(-J\gamma_B), [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) \\ = \ & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, e^{-\varepsilon \mathcal{J}}\mathrm{Gr}(-J\gamma_B), [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) \\ = \ & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(-e^{-\varepsilon J}J\gamma_B e^{-\varepsilon J}), [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]), \end{aligned} \tag{3.62}$$

where in the second equality we have used Symplectic invariance property of μ_F^{CLM} index in [11]. Choose a C^1 path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{\frac{p\tau}{4}}$ such that $\gamma(t) = -e^{-\varepsilon J}J\gamma_B e^{-\varepsilon J}$ for all $t \in [\frac{q\tau}{,}\frac{p\tau}{4}]$. Denote by $D(t) = -J\dot{\gamma}(t)\gamma(t)^{-1}$ for $t \in [0, \frac{p\tau}{4}]$. For $t \in [\frac{q\tau}{,}\frac{p\tau}{4}]$, by direct computation we have

$$D(t) = -J\frac{d}{dt}(-e^{-\varepsilon J}J\gamma e^{-\varepsilon J})(-e^{-\varepsilon J}J\gamma e^{-\varepsilon J})^{-1} = -Je^{-\varepsilon J}B(t)e^{\varepsilon J}J. \tag{3.63}$$

Since $B \geq 0$ we have $D(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [q\tau, p\tau]$ and $D \in C([0, \frac{p\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$. For $s \geq 0$, we define $D_s(t) = D(t) + sI_{2n}$ and symplectic path $\gamma_s(t)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}\gamma_s(t) = JD_s(t)\gamma_s(t), \quad t \in [0, \frac{p\tau}{4}] \\ & \gamma_s(0) = I_{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$\gamma_0 = \gamma. \tag{3.64}$$

By the same argument of step2 of the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [42], we have

$$-J\frac{d}{ds}\gamma_s(t)(\gamma_s(t))^{-1} > 0, \quad \text{for}\, t = \frac{p\tau}{4}, \frac{q\tau}{4}. \tag{3.65}$$

By (3.61) and definition of γ_s we have

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_0(\frac{p\tau}{4})) = 0 = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_0(\frac{q\tau}{4})). \tag{3.66}$$

So by (3.65), there is a $\sigma > 0$ small enough such that

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_s(\frac{p\tau}{4})) = 0 = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_s(\frac{q\tau}{4})), \quad \forall s \in [0, \sigma]. \tag{3.67}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_s(\frac{p\tau}{4})), s \in [0, \sigma]) = 0, \\ & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_s(\frac{q\tau}{4})), s \in [0, \sigma]) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

By the Homotopy invariance with respect to end points and Path additivity properties of μ_F^{CLM} index in [11], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_s(\frac{p\tau}{4})), s \in [0, \sigma]) + \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0 a, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_\sigma(t)), t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) \\ = \ & \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_0(t)), t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) + \mu_F^{CLM}(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_s(\frac{p\tau}{4})), s \in [0, \sigma]). \end{aligned} \tag{3.69}$$

So by (3.60), (3.62), (3.64),(3.68) and (3.69), we have

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^p_B) - i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^q_B) = \mu^{CLM}_F(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_\sigma(t)), t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]). \tag{3.70}$$

Since $D(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]$, we have

$$D_\sigma(t) > 0, \quad \forall t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]. \tag{3.71}$$

So by the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [42] and Lemma 2.6 of [42], we have

$$\mu^{CLM}_F(L_0 \times L_0, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_\sigma(t)), t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4}]) = \sum_{t \in [\frac{q\tau}{4}, \frac{p\tau}{4})} \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_\sigma(t)) \geq 0. \tag{3.72}$$

Thus by (3.70) and (3.72), (3.59) holds. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is complete. ∎

By similar proof of Theorem 3.2 we have the following Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.3. If $\tau > 0$ and $B \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ satisfying condition (B1) and $B \geq 0$, then for $j = 0, 1$ and any two positive integers $p \geq q$ there holds

$$i_{L_j}(\gamma^p_B) \geq i_{L_j}(\gamma^q_B). \tag{3.73}$$

4 Proof of Theorems 1.1-1.3 and Corollary 1.2

In this section we study the minimal period problem for brake orbits of the reversible Hamiltonian system (1.1) and complete the proof of Theorems 1.1-1.3 and Corollary 1.2.

For $T > 0$, we set $E = W^{1/2,2}(S_T, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ with the usual norm and inner product denoted by $||\cdot||$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle$ respectively, and two subspaces of E by $E_T = \{x \in W^{1/2,2}(S_\tau, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) |\, x(-t) = Nx(t) \ a.e.\ t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ and $\check{E}_T = \{x \in W^{1/2,2}(S_\tau, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) |\, x(-t) = -Nx(t) \ a.e.\ t \in \mathbf{R}\}$. Then we have

$$E = E_T \oplus \check{E}_T. \tag{4.1}$$

As in Section 3, we define two selfadjoint operators A_T on E_T by the same way as (3.3). We also define two selfadjoint operators $\check{A}_T$ on $\check{E}_T$ by the following bilinear form:

$$\langle \check{A}_{\mathbf{T}} x, y \rangle = \int_0^T -J\dot{x} \cdot y \, dt. \tag{4.2}$$

Then A_T is a bounded operator on E_T and dim ker $A_T = n$, the Fredholm index of A_T is zero, and $\check{A}_T$ is a bounded operator on $\check{E}_T$ and dim ker $\check{A}_T = n$, the Fredholm index of $\check{A}_T$ is zero.

Set

$$E_T(j) = \left\{ z \in E_T \,\middle|\, z(t) = \exp(\frac{2j\pi t}{T}J)a + \exp(-\frac{2j\pi t}{T}J)b,\ \forall t \in \mathbf{R};\ \forall a,\, b \in L_0 \right\},$$

$$E_{T,m} = E_T(0) + E_T(1) + \cdots + E_T(m)$$

and

$$\check{E}_T(j) = \left\{ z \in E_T \,\middle|\, z(t) = \exp(\frac{2j\pi t}{T}J)a + \exp(-\frac{2j\pi t}{T}J)b,\ \forall t \in \mathbf{R};\ \forall a,\, b \in L_1 \right\},$$

$$\check{E}_{T,m} = \check{E}_T(0) + \check{E}_T(1) + \cdots + \check{E}_T(m).$$

Let $P_{T,m}$ be the orthogonal projection from E_T to $E_{T,m}$ and $\check{P}_{T,m}$ be the orthogonal projection from $\check{E}_T$ to $\check{E}_{T,m}$ for $m = 0, 1, 2, ...$, then $\Gamma_T = \{P_{T,m} : m = 0, 1, 2, ...\}$ and $\check{\Gamma}_T = \{\check{P}_{T,m} : m = 0, 1, 2, ...\}$ are the usual Galerkin approximation schemes w.r.t. A_T and $\check{A}_T$ respectively.

For $z \in E_T$, we define

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle A_T z, z\rangle - \int_0^T H(z)dt. \tag{4.3}$$

It is well known that $f \in C^2(E_T, \mathbf{R})$ whenever,

$$H \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad |H''(x)| \leq a_1|x|^s + a_2 \tag{4.4}$$

for some $s \in (1, +\infty)$ and all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$.

By similar argument of Lemma 4.1 of [51], looking for T-periodic brake orbit solutions of (1.1) is equivalent to look for critical points of f.

In order to get the information about the Maslov-type indices, we need the following theorem which was proved in [24, 28, 48].

Theorem 4.1. *Let W be a real Hilbert space with orthogonal decomposition $E = X \oplus Y$, where $\dim X < +\infty$. Suppose $f \in C^2(W, \mathbf{R})$ satisfies (PS) condition and the following conditions:*

(i) There exist ρ, $\delta > 0$ such that $f(w) \geq \delta$ for any $w \in W$;

(ii) There exist $e \in \partial B_1(0) \cap Y$ and $r_0 > \rho > 0$ such that for any $w \in \partial Q$, $f(w) < \delta$ where $Q = (B_{r_0}(0) \cap X) \oplus \{re : 0 \leq r \leq r_0\}$, $B_r(0) = \{w \in W : ||w|| \leq r\}$.

Then (1) f possesses a critical value $c \geq \delta$, which is given by

$$c = \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{w \in Q} f(h(w)),$$

where $\Gamma = \{h \in C(Q, E) : h = id \text{ on } \partial Q\}$;

(2) There exists $w_0 \in \mathcal{K}_c \equiv \{w \in E :\ f'(w) = 0,\ f(w) = c\}$ such that the Morse index $m^-(w_0)$ of f at w_0 satisfies

$$m^-(w_0) \leq \dim X + 1.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For any given $T > 0$, we prove the existence of T-periodic brake solution of (1.1) whose minimal period satisfies the inequalities in the conclusion of Theorem 1.2. We divide the proof into five steps.

Step 1. We truncate the function $\hat{H}$ suitably and evenly such that it satisfies the growth condition (4.4). Hence corresponding new reversible function H satisfies condition (4.4).

We follow the method in Rabinowitz's pioneering work [43] (cf. also [18], [44] and [51]). Let $K > 0$ and $\chi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R})$ such that $\chi \equiv 1$ if $y \leq K$, $\chi \equiv 0$ if $y \geq K$ and $\chi'(y) < 0$ if $y \in (K, K+1)$, Where K will be determined later. Set

$$\hat{H}_K(z) = \chi(|z|)\hat{H}(z) + (1 - \chi(|z|))R_K|z|^4 \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$H_K(z) = \frac{1}{2}B_0x \cdot x + \hat{H}_K(z), \tag{4.6}$$

where the constant R_K satisfies

$$R_K \geq \max_{K \leq |z| \leq K+1} \frac{H(z)}{|z|^4}. \tag{4.7}$$

Then $H_K \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$. Since $\hat{H}$ satisfies (H3), $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $\hat{H}_K(z) \leq \varepsilon|z|^2$ for $|z| \leq \delta_1$. It is easy to see that $H_K(z)|z|^4$ is uniformly bounded as $|z| \to +\infty$, there is an $M_1 = M_1(\varepsilon, K)$ such that $\hat{H}_K(z) \leq M_1|z|^4$ for $|z| \geq \delta_1$. So

$$\hat{H}_K(z) \leq \varepsilon|z|^2 + M_1|z|^4, \quad \forall z \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}. \tag{4.8}$$

Set

$$f_K(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle A_T z, z\rangle - \int_0^T H_K(z)dt, \qquad \forall z \in \hat{E}.$$

Then $f_K \in C^2(E_T, \mathbf{R})$ and

$$f_K(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle (A_T - B_{0T})z, z\rangle - \int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z)dt, \qquad \forall z \in \hat{E},$$

where B_{0T} is the selfadjoint linear compact operator on E_T defined by

$$\langle B_{0T}z, z\rangle = \int_0^T B_0 z(t) \cdot z(t)\, dt.$$

Step 2. For $m > 0$, let $f_{Km} = f|E_{T,m}$. We show f_{Km} satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1. We set

$$X_m = M^-(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{0T})P_{T,m}) \oplus M^0(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{0T})P_{T,m}),$$
$$Y_m = M^+(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{0T})P_{T,m}).$$

For $z \in Y_m$, by (4.8), (3.2), and the fact that $P_{T,j}B_{0T} = P_{T,j}B_{0T}$ for $j > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Km}(z) &= \frac{1}{2}\langle (A_T - B_{0T})z, z\rangle - \int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z)dt \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}||(A_T - B_{0T})^{\#}||^{-1}||z||^2 - (\varepsilon||z||^2_{L^2} + M_1||z||^4_{L^4}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}||(A_T - B_{0T})^{\#}||^{-1}||z||^2 - (\varepsilon C_2^2 + M_1C_4^4||z||^2)||z||^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where C_2 and C_4 are constants for $s = 2$, 4 for the Sobolev embedding of inequality (3.2), and they are independent of m and K.

So if choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\varepsilon C_2^2 < \frac{1}{4}||(A_T - B_{0T})^{\#}||^{-1}$, then there exists $\rho = \rho(K) > 0$ small enough and $\delta = \delta(K) > 0$, which are independent of m, such that

$$f_m(z) \geq \delta, \qquad \forall z \in \partial B_\rho(0) \cap Y_m. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $e \in B_1(0) \cap Y_m$ and set

$$Q_m = \{re : 0 \leq r \leq r_1\} \oplus (B_{r_1}(0) \cap X_m),$$

where r_1 will be determined later. Let $z = z_- + z_0 \in B_{r_1}(0) \cap X_m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Km}(z + re) &= \frac{1}{2}\langle (A_T - B_{0T})z, z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}r^2\langle (A_T - B_{0T})e, e\rangle - \int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z + re)dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}||A_T - B_{0T}||r^2 - \frac{1}{2}||(A_T - B_{0T})^{\#}||^{-1}||z_-||^2 - \int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z + re)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Since $\hat{H}$ satisfies (H2) we have

$$\hat{H}_K(x) \geq a_1|x|^\alpha - a_2, \qquad \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n},$$

where $\alpha = \min\{\mu, 4\}$, $a_1 > 0$, a_2 are two constants independent of K and m. Then there holds

$$\int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z + re)dt \geq a_1 \int_0^T |z + re|^\alpha - Ta_2 \geq a_3(||z_0||^\alpha_{L^\alpha} + r^\alpha) - a_4, \tag{4.12}$$

where a_3 and a_4 are constants independent of K and m. By (4.11) and (4.12) we have

$$f_{Km}(z + re) \leq \frac{1}{2}||A_T - \hat{B}_0||r^2 - \frac{1}{2}||(A - B_0)^{\#}||^{-1}||z_-||^2 - a_3(||z_0||^\alpha_{L^\alpha} + r^\alpha) + a_4.$$

Since $\alpha > 2$ there exists a constant $r_1 > \rho > 0$, which are independent of K and m, such that

$$f_{Km} \leq 0, \qquad \forall z \in \partial Q_m. \tag{4.13}$$

Then by Theorem 4.1, f_{Km} has a critical value c_{Km}, which is given by

$$c_{Km} = \inf_{g\in\Gamma_m} \max_{z\in Q_m} f_{Km}(g(z)), \tag{4.14}$$

where $\Gamma_m = \{g \in C(Q_m, \hat{E}_m | g = id; \text{on } \partial Q_m\}$. Moreover there is a critical point x_{Km} of f_{Km} which satisfies

$$m^-(x_{Km}) \leq \dim X_m + 1. \tag{4.15}$$

Step 3. We prove that there exists a T-periodic brake orbit solution x_T of (1.1) which satisfies $i_{L_0}(x_T) \leq i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) + 1$.

Note that $id \in \Gamma_m$, by (4.11) and condition (H4), we have

$$c_{Km} \leq \sup_{z\in Q_m} f_{Km}(z) \leq \frac{1}{2}||A_T - B_{0T}||r_1^2.$$

Then $\{c_{Km}\}$ possesses a convergent subsequence, we still denote it by $\{c_{Km}\}$ for convenience. So there is a $c_K \in [\delta,]$ such that $c_{Km} \to c_K$.

By the same arguments as in section 6 of [44] we have f_K satisfies $(PS)_c^*$ condition for $c \in \mathbf{R}$, i.e., any sequence z_m such that $z_m \in E_{T,m}$, $f'_{Km}(z_m) \to 0$ and $f_{Km}(z_m) \to c$ possesses a convergent subsequence in E_T. Hence in the sense of subsequence we have

$$x_{Km} \to x_K, \qquad f_K(x_K) = c_K, \qquad f'_K(x_K) = 0. \tag{4.16}$$

By similar argument in [44], x_K is a classical nonconstant symmetric T-periodic solution of

$$\dot{x} = JH'_K(x), \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}.$$

Set $B_K(t) = H''_K(x_K(t))$, Then $B_K \in C([0, T/2], \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$ and satisfies condition (B1). Let B_{KT} be the operator defined by the same way of the definition of B_{0T}. It is easy to show that

$$||f''(z) - (A_T - B_{KT})|| \to 0 \qquad \text{as } ||z - x_K|| \to 0.$$

So for $0 < d \leq \frac{1}{4}||(A_T - B_{K_T})^{\#}||^{-1}$, there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that

$$||f''_{Km}(z) - P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}|| \leq ||f''(z) - (A_T - B_{KT})|| \leq \frac{1}{2}d, \ \forall z \in \{z \in E_T : ||z - x_K|| \leq r_2\}.$$

Then for $z \in \{z \in E_T : ||z - x_K|| \leq r_2\} \cap E_{T,m}$, $\forall u \in M_d^-(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}) \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f''_{Km}(z)u, u\rangle &\leq \langle P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}u, u\rangle + \|f''_{Km}(z) - P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}\|\|u\|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}d\|u\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$m^-(f''_{Km}(z)) \geq \dim M_d^-(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}). \tag{4.17}$$

By Theorem 2.1 of [31] and Remark 3.1, there is $m^* > 0$ such that for $m \geq m^*$ we have

$$\dim X_m = mn + n + i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0), \tag{4.18}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(P_{T,m}(A_T - B_{KT})P_{T,m}) = mn + n + i_{L_0}(B_K). \tag{4.19}$$

Then by (4.15), (4.16), and (4.17)-(4.19), we have

$$i_{L_0}(B_K) \leq i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) + 1.$$

By the similar argument as in the section 6 of [44], there is a constant M_2 independent of K such that $||x_K||_\infty \leq M_2$. Choose $K > M_2$. Then x_K is a non-constant symmetric T-periodic solution of the problem (1.1). From now on in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we write $B = B_K$ and $x_T = x_K$. Then x_T is a non-constant symmetric T-periodic solution of the problem (1.1), and B satisfies

$$i_{L_0}(x_T) = i_{L_0}(B) \leq i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) + 1. \tag{4.20}$$

Since x_T obtained in Step 3 is a nonconstant and symmetric T-period solution, its minimal period $\tau = \frac{T}{k}$ for some $k \in \mathbf{N}$.

We denote by $x_\tau = x_T|_{[0,\tau]}$, then it is a brake orbit solution of (1.1) with the minimal τ and $X_T = x_\tau^k$ being the k times iteration of x_τ. As in Section 1, let γ_{x_T} and γ_{x_τ} be the symplectic path associated to (τ, x) and (T, x_T) respectively. Then $\gamma_{x_\tau} \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{2}], \mathrm{Sp}(2n))$ and $\gamma_{x_T} \in C([0, \frac{T}{2}], \mathrm{Sp}(2n))$. Also we have $\gamma_{x_T} = \gamma_{x_\tau}^k$.

Step 4. We prove that

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) \geq 1.$$

We follow the way of the proof of Theorem 1.2 of [18]. By the same way as $\check{E}_T$ and $\check{A}_T$ we can define the space $\check{E}_\tau$ and the operator $\check{A}_\tau$ on it. Also we can define the orthogonal projection $\check{P}_\tau, m$ and the subspaces $\check{E}_{\tau,m}$ for $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots.$ Let $\check{B}_\tau$ be the selfadjoint linear compact operator on $\check{E}_T$ defined by:

$$\langle \check{B}_\tau z, z\rangle = \int_0^\tau B(t)z(t) \cdot z(t)\, dt, \quad \forall z \in \check{E}_\tau.$$

For $z \in \check{E}_\tau$, set

$$f_\tau(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle(\check{A}_\tau - \check{B}_\tau)z, z\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \check{A}_\tau z, z\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau H''(x_\tau(t))z \cdot z\, dt$$

and

$$f_{\tau m}(w) = f_\tau(w), \qquad \forall w \in \check{E}_{\tau,m}.$$

Let

$$X = \{z \in L_1 \,|\, B_0 z = 0 \text{ and } \hat{H}''(x_\tau(t))z = 0,\ \forall t \in \mathbf{R}\}$$

and Y be the orthogonal complement of X in L_1, i.e., $L_1 = X \oplus Y$. Since $H''(x_\tau(t)) = B_0 + \hat{H}''(x_\tau(t))$, by (H4) it is easy to see that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^\tau H''(x_\tau(t))z_0 \cdot z_0 \, dt \geq \lambda_0 ||z_0||, \qquad \forall z_0 \in Y.$$

Thus for any $z = z_- + z_0 \in \check{P}_{\tau,m} M^-(\check{A}_\tau) \oplus Y$ with $||z|| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\tau m}(z) &= \frac{1}{2}\langle(\check{A}_\tau - \check{B}_\tau)z, z\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle \check{A}_\tau z_-, z_-\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau H''(x_\tau(t))z \cdot z \, dt & (4.21)\\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}||\check{A}_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}||z_-||^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau H''(x_\tau(t))z_0 \cdot z_0 \, dt - \int_0^\tau H''(x_\tau(t))z_- \cdot z_0 \, dt & \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}||\check{A}_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}||z_-||^2 - \frac{\lambda_0}{2}||z_0||^2 + \max_{t\in[0,\tau]} ||H''(x_\tau(t))|| \, ||z_-|| \, ||z_0||. & (4.22) \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$||z_-|| \, ||z_0|| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}||z_-||^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}||z_0||^2, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

By choosing ε suitably one can see that there exists $0 < c_0 < 1$ with $|1 - c_0|$ small enough such that if $||z_0|| \leq c_0$,

$$f_{\tau m}(z) \leq -\frac{\lambda_0}{4}c_0^2. \tag{4.23}$$

When $||z_0|| \leq c_0$, we have $||z_-||^2 \geq 1 - c_0^2$. By (4.21) and (H4)

$$f_{\tau m}(z) \leq -\frac{1}{2}||\check{A}_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}||z_-||^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}||\check{A}_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}(1 - c_0^2).$$

Hence we always have

$$f_{\tau m}(z) \leq -c||z||^2, \qquad \forall z \in \check{P}_{\tau,m} M^-(\check{A}_\tau) \oplus Y, \tag{4.24}$$

where $c = \max\{\frac{\lambda_0}{4}c_0^2, \frac{1}{2}||\check{A}_\tau^{\#}||^{-1}(1 - c_0^2)\}$ is independent of m. Let

$$d = \min\{\frac{1}{4}||(\check{A}_\tau - \check{B}_\tau)^{\#}||^{-1}, \frac{c}{2}\}.$$

By (4.24) and Theorem 2.1 of [31] and Remark 3.1 and the definition of $i_{L_1}(\gamma(x_\tau))$, for m large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} mn + n + i_{L_1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) &= \dim M_d^-(\check{P}_{\tau,m}(\check{A}_\tau - \check{B}_\tau)\check{P}_{\tau,m}) \\ &\geq \dim(\check{P}_{\tau,m} M^-(\check{A}_\tau) \oplus Y) \\ &= mn + n - \dim X, \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

which implies that

$$i_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) \geq -\dim X. \tag{4.26}$$

Since x_τ is a nonconstant brake solution of (1.1), by the definition of X we have

$$\nu_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) \geq \dim X + 1. \tag{4.27}$$

Hence by (4.26) and (4.27) we have

$$i_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) + \nu_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) \geq 1. \tag{4.28}$$

Step 5. Finish the proof of Theorem 1.3.

By Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 6.2 below (also Theorem 2.6 of [32]) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^k) \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \frac{k-1}{2}(i_1(\gamma^2) + \nu_1(\gamma^2) - n), \quad \text{if } k \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1, \tag{4.29}$$

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^k) \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + (\frac{k}{2} - 1)(i_1(\gamma^2) + \nu_1(\gamma^2) - n), \quad \text{if } k \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{4.30}$$

Since B_0 is semipositive and $\hat{H}$ satisfies (H4), by Corollary 3.2, we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) \geq 0. \tag{4.31}$$

By Proposition C of [42] and the definitions of i_{L_0} and i_{L_1} we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_1(\gamma^2) &= i_{L_0}(\gamma) + i_{L_1}(\gamma) + n, \\ \nu_1(\gamma^2) &= \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

So by (4.28) and (4.31) we have

$$i_1(\gamma^2) + \nu_1(\gamma^2) - n \geq 1. \tag{4.32}$$

So by (4.29), (4.30) and (4.32) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^k) \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \frac{k-1}{2}, \quad \text{if } k \in 2\mathbf{N}-1, \tag{4.33}$$

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^k) \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \frac{k-1}{2}, \quad \text{if } k \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{4.34}$$

By (4.20) and the definition of γ_{x_τ} we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau})^k) \leq i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) + 1. \tag{4.35}$$

By Corollary 3.2, we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) \geq -n. \tag{4.36}$$

So by (4.33)-(4.36) we have

$$k \leq 2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 4. \tag{4.37}$$

Claim 2. k can not be $2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 3$ and $2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 4$.

Hence by Claim 2, $k \leq 2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 2$, and Theorem 1.3 holds.

Proof of Claim 2. We first show that k can not be $2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 3$. Otherwise, we have

$$k = 2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 3. \tag{4.38}$$

The equality in (4.29) holds, then by (4.32), in this case there must hold that

$$i_1(\gamma^2) + \nu_1(\gamma^2) - n = 1 \tag{4.39}$$

and

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = -n. \tag{4.40}$$

By Corollary 3.2 again we have that

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = n. \tag{4.41}$$

Also by (4.39) we have

$$i_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau) + \nu_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) = 1.$$

Denote by $\nu_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) = r$. Then we have

$$i_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) = 1 - r, \tag{4.42}$$

$$\nu_{L^1}(\gamma(x_\tau)) \geq 1. \tag{4.43}$$

By (4.40) and (4.42) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = r - n - 1. \tag{4.44}$$

So we can write $\gamma_{x_\tau}(\frac{\tau}{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ with A, C, D to be $n \times n$ real matrices. Hence by (4.2) of [35] we have

$$\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) = N\gamma_{x_\tau}(\frac{\tau}{2})^{-1}N\gamma_{x_\tau}(\frac{\tau}{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} D^TA & 0 \\ C^TA & A^TD \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\gamma_{x_\tau}(\frac{\tau}{2})$ is a symplectic matrix we have

$$A^TD = D^TA = I_n, \quad C^TA = A^TC.$$

So we have

$$\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ C^TA & I_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that here C^TA is a symmetric matrix and A is invertible. So by (4.43) there exists a orthogonal matrix Q such that

$$Q(C^TA)Q^T = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, ..., 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_p, \lambda_{p+1}, ..., \lambda_{n-p-r}) \tag{4.45}$$

with $\lambda_j > 0$ for $j = 1, 2, ..., p$ and $\lambda_j < 0$, for $j = p+1, p+2, ..., n-p-r$, where $1 \le p \le n-r$. Then it is easy to check that $(I_2)^{\diamond r} \diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond p} \diamond N_1(1,1)^{\diamond(n-p-r)} \in \Omega^0(\gamma_{x_\tau})$ with $\Omega^0(\gamma_{x\tau})$ to be defined in Section 6 below. Then by Theorem 6.2 below or Theorem 2.6 of [32], when the equality in (4.29) holds, there must hold $p = n-r$. Hence we have

$$Q(C^TA)Q^T = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, ..., 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-r}), \tag{4.46}$$

$$\lambda_j > 0, \qquad \text{for } j = 1, 2, ..., n-r. \tag{4.47}$$

Case 1. If $\det A > 0$, then there exists a invertible matrix path $\rho(s)$ for $s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$ connecting it and I_n such that $\rho(0) = I_n$ and $\rho(1) = A$.

We define a symplectic path ϕ_1 by

$$\phi_1(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho(s)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho(s)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}].$$

Then $\nu_{L_j}(\phi_1(s) = \mathit{constant}$ for $j = 0, 1$ and $s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$. So by Definition 2.5 and Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.11 of [42], for $j = 1, 2$ we have

$$\mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\phi_1), [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]) = 0. \tag{4.48}$$

Also we have $\phi_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ and $\phi_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ A^T C & I_n \end{pmatrix}$.

Note that we can always choose the orthogonal matrix Q in (4.46) such that $\det Q = 1$ (otherwise we replace it by $\mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, ..., 1)Q$). Then there exists a invertible matrix path $\rho_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$ connecting it and I_n such that $\rho_2(0) = I_n$ and $\rho_2(\frac{\tau}{2}) = Q$. We define a symplectic path ϕ_2 by

$$\phi_2(s) = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ \rho_2(s) A^T C \rho_2(s)^T & I_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}].$$

Then $\nu_{L_j}(\phi_2(s) = \mathit{constant}$ and for $j = 0, 1$ and $s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$. So by Definition 2.5 and Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.11 of [42] again, for $j = 1, 2$ we have

$$\mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\phi_2), [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]) = 0. \tag{4.49}$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2(0) &= \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ A^T C & I_n \end{pmatrix} \\ \phi_2(\frac{\tau}{2}) &= \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ Q A^T C Q^T & I_n \end{pmatrix} = (I_2)^{\diamond^r} \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_1) \diamond \cdots \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_{n-r}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

By the Reparametrization invariance and Path additivity of the Maslov index μ_F^{CLM} in [11] and (4.48) and (4.49), for $j = 1, 2$ we have

$$\mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma_{x_\tau}), [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_j, \mathrm{Gr}(\phi_2 * (\phi_1 * \gamma_{x_\tau})), [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]),$$

where the joint path $\phi_2 * (\phi_1 * \gamma_{x_\tau})$ is defined by (6.1). So by definition for $j = 0, 1$ we have

$$i_{L_j}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = i_{L_j}(\phi_2 * (\phi_1 * \gamma_{x_\tau})). \tag{4.51}$$

Then by Theorem 2.3 and (4.50) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon((I_2)^{\diamond^r} \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_1)^T \diamond \cdots \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_{n-r})^T). \tag{4.52}$$

By Remark 2.1 and the computations (2.68)-(2.71) at the end of Section 2, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon((I_2)^{\diamond^r} \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_1)^T \diamond \cdots \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_{n-r})^T) = 2(r - n). \tag{4.53}$$

So we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = r - n, \tag{4.54}$$

which contradicts to (4.44).

Case 2. If $\det A < 0$, then there exists a invertible matrix path $\rho(s)$ for $s \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]$ such that $\rho(0) = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, 1, ..., 1)$ and $\rho(1) = A$. by similar arguments we can show that

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon((-I_2) \diamond (I_2)^{\diamond(r-1)} \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_1) \diamond \cdots \diamond N_1(1, \lambda_{n-r})) = r - n, \tag{4.55}$$

which still contradicts to (4.44).

Hence we have proved that k can not be $2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 3$. By the same argument we can prove that k can not be $2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2n + 4$. Thus Claim 2 is proved and the proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Note that this is the case $B_0 = 0$ of Theorem 1.3. Then by Theorem 1.3 and the fact that $i_{L_0}(0) = -n$ and $\nu_{L_0}(0) = n$, the minimal period of x_T is no less than $\frac{T}{2n+2}$. In the following we prove that if (1.9) holds then the minimal period of x_T belongs to $\{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$.

Let x_T is the k-time iteration of x_τ with τ being the minimal period of x_τ and $\tau = \frac{T}{k}$. Then by the proof of Theorem 1.3 with $B_0 = 0$ we have (4.28), (4.29) and (4.30) hold. Since (1.9) holds, by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x\tau}) \geq 0. \tag{4.56}$$

So by (4.29) if k is odd, we have

$$1 \geq 0 + \frac{k-1}{2}. \tag{4.57}$$

Hence $k \leq 3$. Now we prove that k can not be 3, other wise we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = 0, \tag{4.58}$$

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = 0, \tag{4.59}$$

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = 1. \tag{4.60}$$

And by Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 6.2 we have

$$1 \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma^3_{x_\tau}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + i_{e^{2\pi/3}}(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) \geq (i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) - \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) - n) \geq 1. \tag{4.61}$$

Then all the equalities of (4.61) hold. By Lemma 6.2 and 2 of Theorem 6.2 again, there exist $p \geq 0$, $q \geq 0$ with $p + q \leq n$ and $0 < \theta_1 \leq \theta_2 \leq ... \leq \theta_{n-(p+q)} \leq 2\pi/3$ such that

$$(I_2)^{\diamond p} \diamond N_1(1, -1)^{\diamond q} \diamond R(\theta_1) \diamond R(\theta_2) \diamond ... \diamond R(\theta_{n-p-q}) \in \Omega^0((\gamma^2_{x_\tau})(\tau)), \tag{4.62}$$

where $\Omega^0(M)$ for a symplectic matrix M is defined in Section 6. By (4.62) we have

$$-1 \notin \sigma((\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)(\tau)). \tag{4.63}$$

Now we denote by $\gamma_{x_\tau}(\frac{\tau}{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ with A, B, C, D are all $n \times n$ matrices.

Claim 1. Both D and A are invertible.

We first prove D is invertible. Otherwise, there exists a $n \times n$ invertible matrix P such that $P^{-1}DP = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$ and R is a $(n-r) \times (n-r)$ matrix with $r \geq 1$. So we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (P^{-1})^T & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$. Since $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}$ is a symplectic matrix, we have

$$\tilde{A}^T D - \tilde{C}^T \tilde{B} = I_n. \tag{4.64}$$

Since $\tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$, $\tilde{B}^T \tilde{D}$ and $\tilde{A}^T \tilde{D}$ both have form

$$\tilde{B}^T \tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{A}^T \tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.65}$$

So by (4.64) and (4.65) we have

$$\tilde{A}^T \tilde{D} + \tilde{C}^T \tilde{B} = 2\tilde{A}^T \tilde{D} - I_n = \begin{pmatrix} -I_r & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.66}$$

By direct computation and (4.65) and (4.66) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& N \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} N \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix} \\
= & \begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^{-1} \end{pmatrix} N \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} N \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (P^{-1})^T & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix} \qquad (4.67) \\
= & \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D}^T \tilde{A} + \tilde{B}^T \tilde{C} & 2\tilde{B}^T \tilde{D} \\ 2\tilde{A}^T \tilde{C} & \tilde{A}^T \tilde{D} + \tilde{C}^T \tilde{B} \end{pmatrix} \\
= & \begin{pmatrix} * & * & 0 & * \\ * & * & 0 & * \\ * & * & -I_r & * \\ * & * & 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \qquad (4.68)
\end{aligned}$$

Since by (4.2) o f[35] we have

$$\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) = N\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} N\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix},$$

by (4.67) and (4.68) we have

$$-1 \in \sigma(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau)),$$

which contradicts to (4.63). Thus we have proved that D is invertible. Similarly we can prove A is invertible, and Claim 1 is proved.

Claim 2. There exists a invertible $n \times n$ real matrix Q with det$Q > 0$ such that

$$Q^{-1}(B^TC)Q = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, ..., 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...\lambda_{n-r}) \tag{4.69}$$

with $r = \nu_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau})$ and $\lambda_i \in (-1, 0)$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n - r$.

In fact

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) &= N\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} N\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} D^T & B^T \\ C^T & A^T \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I + 2B^TC & 2B^TD \\ 2A^TC & I + 2C^TB \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.70}$$

Since B and D are both invertible, for any $\omega \in \mathbf{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}(I_n + 2C^TB - \omega I_n)D^{-1}(B^T)^{-1} & I_n \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n & 2B^TD \\ 2A^TC & I + 2C^TB - \omega I_n \end{pmatrix} \\ = &\begin{pmatrix} I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n & 2B^TD \\ -\frac{1}{2}(I_n + 2C^TB - \omega I_n)D^{-1}(B^T)^{-1}(I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n) + 2A^TC & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) - \omega I_{2n}) &= \det(B^TD)\det((I_n + 2C^TB - \omega I_n)D^{-1}(B^T)^{-1}(I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n) - 4A^TC) \\ &= \det(D[(I_n + 2C^TB - \omega I_n)D^{-1}(B^T)^{-1}(I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n) - 4A^TC]B^T) \\ &= \det(D[I_n + 2C^TB - \omega I_n)D^{-1}(B^T)^{-1}(I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n]B^T - 4DA^TCB^T) \\ &= \det((I + 2B^TC - \omega I_n)^2 - 4(1 + CB^T)CB^T) \\ &= \det(\omega^2 I_n - 2\omega(I + 2CB^T) + I). \end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

By (4.62) we have

$$\sigma(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau)) \subset \mathbf{U}. \tag{4.72}$$

So for $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ by (4.71) we have

$$\det(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau) - \omega I_{2n}) = (-4)^n \omega^n \det(CB^T - \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Re}\,\omega - 1)). \tag{4.73}$$

Hence by (4.62) again we have $\sigma(CB^T) \subset (-1, 0]$, moreover there exists a invertible $n \times n$ matrix S such that

$$S^{-1}CB^TS = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, ..., 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-r}). \tag{4.74}$$

with $r = \nu_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau})$ and $\lambda_i \in (-1, 0)$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n - r$. Since $S^{-1}CB^TS = (B^TS)^{-1}B^TC(B^TS)$, let $Q = B^TS$, if $\det Q < 0$ we replace it by $B^TS\mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, 1, ..., 1)$, Claim 2 is proved.

Continue the proof of Theorem 1.1.

If $\det B > 0$, there is a continuous symplectic matrix path joint $\begin{pmatrix} B^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & B^T \end{pmatrix}$ and I_{2n}. Since

$$\begin{pmatrix} B^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & B^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B^{-1}A & I_n \\ B^TC & B^TD \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.2, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \right) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} B^{-1}A & I_n \\ B^TC & B^TD \end{pmatrix} \right). \tag{4.75}$$

If $\det B < 0$, there is a continuous symplectic path joint $\begin{pmatrix} B^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & B^T \end{pmatrix}$ and $(-I_2) \diamond I_{2(n-1)}$. By direct computation we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \right) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\left((-I_2) \diamond I_{2(n-1)}\right) \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

So by Lemma 2.2 again we have (4.75) holds. So whenever $\det(B) > 0$ or not, (4.75) always holds.

Denote by $\begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B^{-1}A & I_n \\ B^TC & B^TD \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & (P^{-1})^T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & I_n \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}$. By Claim 2, we have

$$\tilde{C} = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, .., 0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-r}). \tag{4.76}$$

Since $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & I_n \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}$ is a symplectic matrix, we have $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{D}$ are both symmetric and have the follow forms:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & D_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where A_{11} and D_{11} are $r \times r$ invertible matrices, A_{22} and D_{22} are $(n-r) \times (n-r)$ invertible matrices. So we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & I_n \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & I_r \\ 0 & D_{11} \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.77}$$

where $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n-r})$.

Since $N \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & I_r \\ 0 & D_{11} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} N \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & I_r \\ 0 & D_{11} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 2D_{11} \\ 0 & I_r \end{pmatrix}$, by (4.62) D_{11} is negative definite. So we can joint it to $-I_r$ by a invertible symmetric matrix path. Then by Lemma 2.2, Remark 2.1, and computations below Remark 2.1 in Section 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & I_r \\ 0 & D_{11} \end{pmatrix} \right) &= \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} -I_r & I_r \\ 0 & -I_r \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= r\, \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon (N_1(-1,1)) \\ &= 2r. \end{aligned} \tag{4.78}$$

Since $M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right)$ is invertible for $\varepsilon = 0$, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right) = \mathrm{sgn} M_0 \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ = \ & \mathrm{sgn} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & \Lambda \\ I_{n-r} & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_{n-r} \\ -I_{n-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{n-r} \\ I_{n-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \\ = \ & \mathrm{sgn} \left\{ 2 \begin{pmatrix} -A_{22}\Lambda & -\Lambda \\ -\Lambda & -D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \\ = \ & \mathrm{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} -A_{22}\Lambda & -\Lambda \\ -\Lambda & -D_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.79}$$

Since $\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ is a symplectic matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{22}D_{22} - \Lambda &= I_{n-r}, \\ A_{22}\Lambda &= \Lambda A_{22}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.80}$$

Hence

$$A_{22}^{-1}\Lambda - D_{22} = A_{22}^{-1}(\Lambda - A_{22}D_{22}) = -A_{22}^{-1}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\begin{pmatrix} I_{n-r} & 0 \\ -A_{22}^{-1} & I_{n-r} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -A_{22}\Lambda & -\Lambda \\ -\Lambda & -D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-r} & -A_{22}^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{n-r} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} -A_{22}\Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22}^{-1}\Lambda - D_{22} \end{pmatrix} \\
= &\begin{pmatrix} -A_{22}\Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -A_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (4.81)
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.80), there exist invertible matrix R such that

$$R^{-1}A_{22}R = \mathrm{diag}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, ..., \alpha_{n-r}), \quad \alpha_i \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\},\ i = 1, 2, ..., n-r, \qquad (4.82)$$

$$R^{-1}\Lambda R = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, ..., \lambda_{i_{n-r}}),\ \ \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_{n-r}\} = \{1, 2, ..., n-r\}. \qquad (4.83)$$

So we have

$$R^{-1}(-A_{22}\Lambda)R = \mathrm{diag}(-\lambda_{i_1}\alpha_1, -\lambda_{i_2}\alpha_2, ..., -\lambda_{i_{n-r}}\alpha_{n-r}), \qquad (4.84)$$

$$R^{-1}(-A_{22}^{-1})R = \mathrm{diag}(-\frac{1}{\alpha_1}, -\frac{1}{\alpha_2}, ..., \frac{1}{\alpha_{n-r}}). \qquad (4.85)$$

Since $\lambda_i \in (-1, 0)$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n-r$, by (4.82)-(4.85) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(-A_{22}\Lambda) + \mathrm{sgn}(-A_{22}^{-1}) = 0. \qquad (4.86)$$

Hence by (4.79), (4.81) and (4.86) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix}\right) = \mathrm{sgn}(-A_{22}\Lambda) + \mathrm{sgn}(-A_{22}^{-1}) = 0. \qquad (4.87)$$

Since $\det Q > 0$ we can joint it to I_n by a invertible matrix path. Hence by Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.1, (4.77), (4.78) and (4.87), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon\left(\begin{pmatrix} B^{-1}A & I_n \\ B^TC & B^TD \end{pmatrix}\right) &= \mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & I_r \\ 0 & D_{11} \end{pmatrix}\right) + \mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon\left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & I_{n-r} \\ \Lambda & D_{22} \end{pmatrix}\right) \\
&= 2r + 0 \\
&= 2r. \qquad (4.88)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 2.3, (4.75) and (4.88) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = r. \qquad (4.89)$$

However by (4.58), (4.60) and $\nu_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = r$ we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = r - 1,$$

which contradicts to (4.89).

Thus we have prove that k can not be 3. So if k is odd, it must be 1. By the same proof we have if k is even, it must be 2. Then $\tau \in \{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. ▮

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Since $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{||B_0||}$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$0 \le B_0 \le ||B_0|| I_{2n} < (\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon) I_{2n}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\gamma_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}(t) = \exp((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)tJ) \quad \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{2}].$$

So we have

$$\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}) = 0,$$
$$i_{L_0}((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)I_{2n}) = 0.$$

Then by (5.40) and Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 we have

$$0 \le i_{-1}(B_0) + \nu_{-1}(B_0) \le i_{-1}((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)I_{2n}) = 0.$$

So we have

$$i_{-1}(B_0) + \nu_{-1}(B_0) = 0.$$

Hence by the same proof of Theorem 1.1, the conclusions of Corollary 1.2 holds. ▮

Remark 4.1. Under the same conditions of Theorem 1.3, if $\int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} H''_{22}(x_T(t))\,dt > 0$, by the same proof of Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\tau \ge \frac{T}{2(i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0)) + 2}.$$

Moreover, if $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{||B_0||}$ or $i_{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{L_0}(B_0) = 0$, we have $\tau \in \{T, \frac{T}{2}\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. This is the case $n = 1$ and $B_0 = 0$ of Theorem 1.3, by the proof Theorem 1.3, for any $T > 0$ we obtain an T-periodic brake solution x_T satisfies

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_T}) \le 1. \tag{4.90}$$

If it's minimal period is $\tau = T/k$ for some $k \in \mathbf{N}$, we denote $x_\tau = x_T|_{[0,\tau]}$. Then by the proof of Theorem 1.3 we have

$$i_1(\gamma^2_{x\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) \geq 2. \tag{4.91}$$

In the following we prove Theorem 1.2 in 2 steps.

Step 1. For $k = 2p+1$ for some $p \geq 0$, we prove that $p = 0$.

Firstly by the proof of Theorem 1.3 we have

$$1 \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma^{2p+1}_{x_\tau}) \geq p(i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) - 1) + i_{L_0}(\gamma). \tag{4.92}$$

We divide the argument into three cases.

Case 1. $i_1(\gamma^2_{x\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 2$. If $\nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 1$, then $i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 1 \in 2\mathbf{Z}+1$. By Lemma 6.3, we have $N_1(1,1) \in \Omega^0(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}(\tau))$. Since

$$1 = i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x\tau}) + 1. \tag{4.93}$$

By Corollary 2.1 we have

$$|i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) - i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau})| \leq 1. \tag{4.94}$$

Then by (4.93) and (4.94) we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) = 0. \tag{4.95}$$

So by Theorem 2.1, Lemma 6.2, and (6.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{L_0}(\gamma^3_{x_\tau}) &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + i_{e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/3}}(\gamma^2_{x\tau}) \\ &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) + S_{N_1(1,1)}(1) \\ &= 0 + 1 + 1 \\ &= 2 > 1 \geq i_{L_0}(\gamma^{2p+1}_{x\tau}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.96}$$

Then by Theorem 3.3 we have

$$2p+1 < 3.$$

Hence $p = 0$.

If $\nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 2$, then $i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 0$. But now $\gamma^2_{x_\tau}(\tau) = I_2$, by Lemma 6.3 $i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) \in 2\mathbf{Z}+1$, which yields a contradiction. So this case can not happen. So in Case 1, we have proved $p = 0$.

Case 2. $i_1(\gamma^2_{x\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) = 3$.

If $\nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)=1$, then

$$i_1(\gamma_{x\tau}^2)=2\in 2\mathbf{Z}. \tag{4.97}$$

By Lemma 6.3 we have $N_1(1,-1)\in\Omega^0((\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)(\tau))$. So if $p\geq 1$, by Theorem 3.3, Theorem 2.1, Lemma 6.2 and (6.13), we have we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1\geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{2p+1}) &\geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^3) \\ &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau})+i_{e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/3}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) \\ &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau})+i_1(\gamma_{x\tau}^2)+S_{N_1(1,-1)}(1) \\ &\geq -1+2+0 \\ &= 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.98}$$

So there must hold

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x\tau})=-1.$$

Then by Corollary 2.1 we have

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau})\leq 0.$$

So we have

$$i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)=i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}+i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau})+1\leq -1+0+1=0,$$

which contradicts (4.97). Thus we have $p=0$.

If $\nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)=2$, then

$$i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)=1,\quad \gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\tau)=I_2. \tag{4.99}$$

If $p\geq 1$, by Theorem 3.3, Theorem 2.1, Corollary 3.2, Lemma 6.2 and (6.13), we have we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1\geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{2p+1}) &\geq i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{2+1}) \\ &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau})+i_{e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/3}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) \\ &= i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau})+i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)+S_{I_2}(1) \\ &\geq -1+1+1 \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

So there must hold

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x\tau})=-1.$$

Then by Corollary 2.1 we have

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) \leq 0.$$

So we have

$$i_1(\gamma^2_{x\tau}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau} + i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) + 1 \leq -1 + 0 + 1 = 0,$$

which contradicts (4.99). Thus we have $p = 0$.

Case 3. $i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) \geq 4$.

In this case $i_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) + \nu_1(\gamma^2_{x_\tau}) - 1 \geq 3$. By Corollary 3.2 we have $i_{L_0} \geq -1$. So by (4.92) we have

$$p \leq 2/3, \tag{4.100}$$

which yields $p = 0$. So we finish Step 1.

Step 2. For $k = 2p + 2$ for some $p \geq 0$, we prove that $p = 0$.

In fact, apply Bott-type iteration formula of Theorem 2.1 to the the case of the iteration time equals to 4 and note that by Corollary 3.1 $i_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}) \geq 0$. Then by the same argument of Step 1, we can prove that $p = 0$.

Thus by Steps 1 and 2, Theorem 1.2 is proved. ∎

A natural question is that can we prove the minimal period is T in this way? We have the following remark.

Remark 4.2. Only use the Maslov-type index theory to estimate the iteration time of the T-periodic brake solution x_T obtained by the first 4 steps in the proof of Theorem 1.3 with $B_0 = 0$, we can not hope to prove T is the minimal period of x_T. Even $H''(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}$. For $n = 1$ and $T = 4\pi$, we can not exclude the following case:

$$x_T(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin t \\ \cos t \end{pmatrix},$$

$$H'(x_T(t)) = x_T(t),$$

$$H''(x_T(t)) \equiv I_{2n}.$$

It is easy to check that $\gamma_{x_T}(t) = R(t)$ for $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. Hence by Lemma 5.1 of [30] or the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [42] we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_T}) = \sum_{0<s<2\pi} \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_T})(s) = 1.$$

In this case the minimal period of x_T is $\frac{T}{2}$. Similarly for $n > 1$ we can construct examples to support this remark.

5 Proof of Theorems 1.4-1.5 and Corollary 1.4

In this section we study the minimal period problem for symmeytric brake orbit solutions of the even reversible Hamiltonian system (1.1) and complete the proof of Theorems 1.4-1.5 and Corollary 1.4.

For $T > 0$, let $E_T = \{x \in W^{1/2,2}(S_\tau, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) | \, x(-t) = Nx(t) \ a.e. \ t \in \mathbf{R}\}$ with the usual $W^{1/2,2}$ norm and inner product. Correspondingly $\hat{E}$ and $\tilde{E}$ are defined to be the symmetric ones and the $\frac{T}{2}$-periodic ones in E_T respectively. Also $\{P_{T,m}\}$ and $\{\hat{P}_m\}$ are the Galerkin approximation scheme w.r.t. A_T and $\hat{A}$ respectively, where $\{P_{T,m}\}$, $\{\hat{P}_m\}$, A_T, and $\hat{A}$ are defined by the same way as in Section 2, we only need to replace τ by T.

For $z \in E_T$, we define

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle A_T z, z\rangle - \int_0^T H(z)dt. \tag{5.1}$$

For $z \in \hat{E}$, we define

$$\hat{f}(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \hat{A} z, z\rangle - \int_0^T H(z)dt. \tag{5.2}$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $z \in \hat{E}$. If $\hat{f}'(z) = 0$, then $f'(z) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $z \in \hat{E}$ and $\hat{f}'(z) = 0$. So for any $y \in \hat{E}$ we have

$$\langle \hat{f}'(z), y\rangle = \int_0^T J\dot{z}(t) \cdot y(t)\, dt - \int_0^T H'(z(t)) \cdot y(t)\, dt = 0, \quad \forall y \in \hat{E}. \tag{5.3}$$

Since H is even and $z \in \hat{E}$, we have

$$H'(z(t + \frac{T}{2})) = H'(-z(t)) = -H'(z(t)). \tag{5.4}$$

So $H'(z) \in \hat{E}$ and

$$\langle f'(z), y\rangle = \int_0^T J\dot{z}(t) \cdot y(t)\, dt - \int_0^T H'(z(t)) \cdot y(t)\, dt = 0, \quad \forall y \in \tilde{E}. \tag{5.5}$$

By (5.4) and (5.5), we have

$$\langle f'(z), y\rangle = \int_0^T J\dot{z}(t) \cdot y(t)\, dt - \int_0^T H'(z(t)) \cdot y(t)\, dt = 0, \quad \forall y \in E_T. \tag{5.6}$$

Hence $f'(z) = 0$ ∎

By Lemma 5.1 and arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 4, to look for the T-period symmetric solutions of (1.1) is equivalent to look for critical points of $\hat{f}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. For any given $T > 0$, we prove the existence of T-periodic symmetric brake orbit solution of (1.1) whose minimal period satisfies the inequalities in the conclusion of

Theorem 1.5. Since the proof of existence of T-periodic symmetric brake orbit solution x_T of (1.1) is similar to that of the proof of Theorem 1.3, we will only give the sketch. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. Similarly as Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, for any $K > 0$ we can truncate the function $\hat{H}$ suitably and evenly to $\hat{H}_K$ such that it satisfies the growth condition (4.4). Correspondingly we obtain a new even and reversible function H_K satisfies condition (4.4).

Set

$$\hat{f}_K(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \hat{A}z, z\rangle - \int_0^T H_K(z)dt, \qquad \forall z \in \hat{E}. \tag{5.7}$$

Then $\hat{f}_K \in C^2(\hat{E}, \mathbf{R})$ and

$$\hat{f}_K(z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle (\hat{A} - \hat{B}_0)z, z\rangle - \int_0^T \hat{H}_K(z)dt, \qquad \forall z \in \hat{E}, \tag{5.8}$$

where $\hat{B}_0$ is the selfadjoint linear compact operator on $\hat{E}$ defined by

$$\langle \hat{B}_0 z, z\rangle = \int_0^T B_0 z(t)\cdot z(t)\, dt. \tag{5.9}$$

Step 2. For $m > 0$, let $\hat{f}_{Km} = \hat{f}|\hat{E}_m$, where $\hat{E}_m = \hat{P}_m\hat{E}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} X_m &= M^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_0)\hat{P}_m) \oplus M^0(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_0)\hat{P}_m), \\ Y_m &= M^+(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_0)\hat{P}_m). \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument of Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we can show that $\hat{f}_K m$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1. Moreover, we obtain a critical point x_{Km} of $\hat{f}_{Km}$ with critical value $C_K m$ which satisfies

$$m^-(x_{Km}) \leq \dim X_m + 1. \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$\delta \leq C_{Km} \leq \frac{1}{2}||\hat{A} - \hat{B}_0||r_1^2, \tag{5.11}$$

where δ is a positive number depending on K and $r_1 > 0$ is independent of K and m.

Step 3. We prove that there exists a symmetric T-periodic brake orbit solution x_T of (1.1) which satisfies

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_{x_T}) \leq i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + 1. \tag{5.12}$$

From the proof of Theorem 1.3 we have f_K satisfies $(PS)_c^*$ condition for $c \in \mathbf{R}$, by the same proof of Lemma 5.1, we have $\hat{f}_K$ satisfies $(PS)_c^*$ condition for $c \in \mathbf{R}$, i.e., any sequence z_m such that $z_m \in \hat{E}_m$, $\hat{f}'_{Km}(z_m) \to 0$ and $\hat{f}_{Km}(z_m) \to c$ possesses a convergent subsequence in $\hat{E}$. Hence in the sense of subsequence we have

$$x_{Km} \to x_K, \qquad \hat{f}_K(x_K) = c_K, \qquad \hat{f}'_K(x_K) = 0. \tag{5.13}$$

By similar argument as in [44], x_K is a classical nonconstant symmetric T-periodic solution of

$$\dot{x} = JH'_K(x), \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}. \tag{5.14}$$

Set $B_K(t) = H''_K(x_K(t))$, Then $B_K \in C(S_{T/2}, \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n}))$. Let $\hat{B}_K$ be the operator defined by the same way of the definition of $\hat{B}_0$. It is easy to show that

$$||\hat{f}''(z) - (\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)|| \to 0 \qquad \text{as } ||z - x_K|| \to 0. \tag{5.15}$$

So for $0 < d < \frac{1}{4}||(A_T - B_{K_T})^{\#}||^{-1}$, there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that

$$||\hat{f}''_{Km}(z) - \hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)\hat{P}_m|| \le ||\hat{f}''(z) - (\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)|| < \frac{1}{2}d, \qquad \forall z \in \{z \in \hat{E} : ||z - x_K|| \le r_2\}. \tag{5.16}$$

Then for $z \in \{z \in \hat{E} : ||z - x_K|| \le r_2\} \cap \hat{E}_m$, $\forall u \in M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_T)\hat{P}_m) \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{f}''_{Km}(z)u, u\rangle &\le \langle \hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)\hat{P}_m u, u\rangle + \|\hat{f}''_{Km}(z) - \hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)\hat{P}_m\|\|u\|^2 \\ &\le -\frac{1}{2}d\|u\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$m^-(\hat{f}''_{Km}(z)) \ge \dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)\hat{P}_m). \tag{5.17}$$

By Theorem 3.1, Remark 3.1, there is $m^* > 0$ such that for $m \ge m^*$ we have

$$\dim X_m = mn + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0), \tag{5.18}$$

$$\dim M_d^-(\hat{P}_m(\hat{A} - \hat{B}_K)\hat{P}_m) = mn + i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_K). \tag{5.19}$$

Then by (5.10), (5.13), and (5.17)-(5.19), we have

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_K) \le i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + 1. \tag{5.20}$$

By the similar argument as in the section 6 of [44], there is a constant M_3 independent of K such that $||x_K||_\infty \le M_3$. Choose $K > M_3$. Then x_K is a non-constant symmetric T-periodic brake orbit solution of the problem (1.1). From now on in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we write $B = B_K$ and $x_T = x_K$. Then x_T is a non-constant symmetric T-periodic solution of the problem (1.1), and B satisfies

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma_{x_T}) =^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}} (B) \le i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + \nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0) + 1. \tag{5.21}$$

Step 4. Finish the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Since x_T obtained in Step 3 is a nonconstant and symmetric T-period brake orbit solution, its minimal period $\tau = \frac{T}{4r+s}$ for some nonnegative integer r and $s = 1$ or $s = 3$. We now estimate r.

We denote by $x_\tau = x_T|_{[0,\tau]}$, then it is a symmetric period solution of (1.1) with the minimal τ and $X_T = x_\tau^{4r+s}$ being the $4r+s$ times iteration of x_τ. As in Section 1, let γ_{x_T} and γ_{x_τ} the symplectic path associated to (τ, x) and (T, x_T) respectively. Then $\gamma_{x_\tau} \in C([0, \frac{\tau}{4}], \mathrm{Sp}(2n))$ and $\gamma_{x_T} \in C([0, \frac{T}{4}], \mathrm{Sp}(2n))$. Also we have $\gamma_{x_T} = \gamma_{x_\tau}^{4r+s}$, which is the $4r+s$ times iteration of γ_{x_τ}.

By (5.21) we have

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{4r+s}) \le i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + 1. \tag{5.22}$$

Since x_τ is also a nonconstant symmetric periodic solution of (1.1). It is clear that

$$\nu_{-1}(x_\tau^2) \quad \ge \quad 1. \tag{5.23}$$

Since $\hat{H}$ satisfies condition (H5) and B_0 is semipositive, by Corollary 3.1 of [51] (also by Theorem 6.2) we have

$$i_{-1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) \ge 0. \tag{5.24}$$

By Corollary 3.2 of [51] (cf. aslo [29]), we have

$$i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) + \nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) \ge n. \tag{5.25}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\gamma_{x_\tau}^4(\frac{\tau}{2} + t) = \gamma_{x_\tau}^2(t)\,\gamma_{x_\tau}^2(\frac{\tau}{2}), \qquad \forall t \in [0, \frac{\tau}{2}]. \tag{5.26}$$

So by Theorem 6.1 of Bott-type iteration formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) + \nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) &= i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) + \nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) + i_{-1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) + \nu_{-1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^2) \\ &\ge n + 0 + 1 \\ &= n + 1. \qquad (5.27) \end{aligned}$$

If $r \ge 1$, then by Theorems 2.2 and 6.2 and (5.27) we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{-1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{4r}) &= i_{-1}((\gamma_{x_\tau}^2)^{2p}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{r} i_{\omega_{2r}^{2j-1}}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) \\ &\ge \sum_{j=1}^{r}(i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) + \nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) - n) \qquad (5.28) \\ &= r(i_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) + \nu_1(\gamma_{x_\tau}^4) - n) \\ &\ge r, \qquad (5.29) \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{2r}=e^{\pi\sqrt{-1}/(2r)}$ as defined in Theorem 2.2.

By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^{4r+s}_{x_\tau})\geq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^{4r}_{x_\tau}). \tag{5.30}$$

Then (5.22), (5.29) and (5.30) yield

$$r\leq i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+1. \tag{5.31}$$

Thus for $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)$ is odd, by (5.31) we have

$$4r+s\leq 4r+3\leq 4(i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0))+7. \tag{5.32}$$

Claim 3. For $i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)+\nu^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(B_0)$ is even, the equality in (5.31) can not hold.

Otherwise, $r\geq 1$ and the equality in (5.28) holds i.e.,

$$i_{\omega_{2r}^{2j-1}}(\gamma^4_{x_\tau})=i_1(\gamma^4_{x_\tau})+\nu_1(\gamma^4_{x_\tau})-n=1,\quad j=1,2,...,r. \tag{5.33}$$

By the definition of ω_{2r}, we have $\omega_{2r}^{2j-1}\neq -1$ for $j=1,2,...,r$. So by (5.33) and 2 of Theorem 6.2, we have $I_{2p}\diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond q}\diamond K\in\Omega^0(\gamma^4_{x_\tau}(\tau))$ for some non-negative integers p and q satisfying $0\leq p+q\leq n$ and $K\in\mathrm{Sp}(2(n-p-q))$ with $\sigma(K)\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\{1\}$ satisfying the condition that all eigenvalues of K located with the arc between 1 and ω_{2r} in $\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\{\pm 1\}$ possess total multiplicity $n-p-q$. So there are no eigenvalues of K on the arc between ω_{2r}^{2j-1} and -1 except ω_{2r}^{2r-1} with $r=1$. However, whether $\omega_{2r}^{2r-1}\in\sigma(\gamma^4_{x_\tau}(\tau))$ or not, we always have

$$S^+_{\gamma^4_{x_\tau}(\tau)}(\omega_{2r}^{2r-1})=0, \tag{5.34}$$

$$i_{\omega_{2r}^{2r-1}}(\gamma^4_{x_\tau})=1. \tag{5.35}$$

So (6.13) and Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{-1}(\gamma^4_{x_\tau}) &= i_{\omega_{2r}^{2r-1}}(\gamma^4_{x_\tau})+S^+_{\gamma^4_{x_\tau}(\tau)}(\omega_{2r}^{2r-1}) \\ &= 1+0=1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

But by (5.26), Lemma 6.1, and Theorem 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{-1}(\gamma^{4r}_{x_\tau}) &= i_{-1}((\gamma^{2r}_{x_\tau})^2) \\ &= i_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^{2r}_{x_\tau})+i_{-\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^{2r}_{x_\tau}) \\ &= 2i_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma^{2r}_{x_\tau}). \end{aligned}$$

Then $i_{-1}(\gamma_{x_\tau}^{4r})$ is an even integer, which yields a contradiction to (5.36). So Claim 3 holds, and we have

$$r \le i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0). \tag{5.37}$$

Hence

$$4r + s \le 4r + 3 \le 4(i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(B_0)) + 3. \tag{5.38}$$

Theorem 1.5 holds from (5.32) and (5.38). ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.4. This is the case $B_0 \equiv 0$ of Theorem 1.2. From Theorem 3.1 it is easy to see that

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0) = 0, \qquad \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0) = 0. \tag{5.39}$$

Then $i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0) + \nu_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}(0) = 0$ and is also even. So Theorem 1.4 holds from Theorem 1.5. ∎

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Since $0 < T < \frac{\pi}{||B_0||}$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$0 \le B_0 \le ||B_0|| I_{2n} < (\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon) I_{2n}. \tag{5.40}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\gamma_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}(t) = \exp((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)tJ) \quad \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{4}]. \tag{5.41}$$

Since

$$\nu_{L_0}(\exp((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)tJ)) = 0, \qquad \forall t \in [0, \frac{T}{2}]. \tag{5.42}$$

We have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma^2_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}) = 0,\ i_{L_0}(\gamma_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}) = 0. \tag{5.43}$$

So by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$i_{\sqrt{-1}}^{L_0}((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)I_{2n}) = i_{L_0}(\gamma^2_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}) - i_{L_0}(\gamma_{(\frac{\pi}{T}-\varepsilon)I_{2n}}) = 0. \tag{5.44}$$

Then by (5.40) and Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 we have

$$0 \le i_{-1}(B_0, \frac{T}{2}) + \nu_{-1}(B_0, \frac{T}{2}) \le i_{-1}((\frac{\pi}{T} - \varepsilon)I_{2n}, \frac{T}{2}) = 0. \tag{5.45}$$

So we have

$$i_{-1}(B_0, \frac{T}{2}) + \nu_{-1}(B_0, \frac{T}{2}) = 0. \tag{5.46}$$

Hence by Theorem 1.1 or Corollary 1.1, the conclusion of Corollary 1.2 holds. ∎

Also a natural question is that can we prove the minimal period is T in this way? We have the following remark.

Remark 5.1. Only use the Maslov-type index theory to estimate the iteration time of the symmetric T-periodic brake solution x_T obtained in the proof of Theorem 1.5 with $B_0 = 0$, we can not hope to prove T is the minimal period of x_T. Even $H''(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}$. For $n = 1$ and $T = 6\pi$, we can not exclude the following case:

$$\begin{aligned} x_T(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} \sin t \\ \cos t \end{pmatrix}, \\ H'(x_T(t)) &= x_T(t), \\ H''(x_T(t)) &\equiv I_{2n}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.47}$$

It is easy to check that $\gamma_{x_T}(t) = R(t)$ for $t \in [0, 3\pi]$. Hence by Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 5.1 of [30] or the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [42] we have

$$i^{L_0}_{\sqrt{-1}}(\gamma_{x_T}) = \sum_{3\pi/4 \le s < 3\pi} \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_T})(s) = 1. \tag{5.48}$$

In this case the minimal period of x_T is $\frac{T}{3}$. Similarly for $n > 1$ we can construct examples to support this remark.

6 Appendix on Maslov-type indices (i_ω, ν_ω)

We first recall briefly the Maslov-type index theory of (i_ω, ν_ω). All the details can be found in [41].

For any $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, the following codimension 1 hypersuface in $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ is defined by:

$$\mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega = \{M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n) | \det(M - \omega I_{2n}) = 0\}.$$

For any two continuous path ξ and η: $[0, \tau] \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\xi(\tau) = \eta(0)$, their joint path is defined by

$$\eta * \xi(t) = \begin{cases} \xi(2t) & \text{if } 0 \le t \le \frac{\tau}{2}, \\ \eta(2t - \tau) & \text{if } \frac{\tau}{2} \le t \le \tau. \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

Given any two $(2m_k \times 2m_k)$- matrices of square block form $M_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ C_k & D_k \end{pmatrix}$ for $k = 1, 2$, as in [41], the $\diamond$-product of M_1 and M_2 is defined by the following $(2(m_1 + m_2) \times 2(m_1 + m_2))$-matrix $M_1 \diamond M_2$:

$$M_1 \diamond M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & 0 & B_2 \\ C_1 & 0 & D_1 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 & D_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A special path ξ_n is defined by

$$\xi_n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 2-\frac{t}{\tau} & 0 \\ 0 & (2-\frac{t}{\tau})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond n}, \qquad \forall t \in [0,\tau].$$

Definition 6.1. For any $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ and $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$, define

$$\nu_\omega(M) = \dim_{\mathbf{C}} \ker(M - \omega I_{2n}). \tag{6.2}$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, define

$$\nu_\omega(\gamma) = \nu_\omega(\gamma(\tau)). \tag{6.3}$$

If $\gamma(\tau) \notin \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega$, we define

$$i_\omega(\gamma) = [\mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega : \gamma * \xi_n], \tag{6.4}$$

where the right-hand side of (6.4) is the usual homotopy intersection number and the orientation of $\gamma * \xi_n$ is its positive time direction under homotopy with fixed endpoints.

If $\gamma(\tau) \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega$, we let $\mathcal{F}(\gamma)$ be the set of all open neighborhoods of γ in $\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, and define

$$i_\omega(\gamma) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma)} \inf\{i_\omega(\beta) \,|\, \beta(\tau) \in U \,\mathrm{and}\, \beta(\tau) \notin \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega\}. \tag{6.5}$$

Then $(i_\omega(\gamma), \nu_\omega(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, ..., 2n\}$, is called the index function of γ at ω.

Lemma 6.1. (Lemma 5.3.1 of [41]) *For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, there hold*

$$i_\omega(\gamma) = i_{\bar{\omega}}(\gamma), \qquad \nu_\omega(\gamma) = \nu_{\bar{\omega}}(\gamma). \tag{6.6}$$

As in [38], for any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(M) = \{P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n) \quad | \quad & \sigma(P) \cap \mathbf{U} = \sigma(M) \cap \mathbf{U} \\ & \mathrm{and}\, \nu_\lambda(P) = \nu_\lambda(M), \ \ \forall \lambda \in \sigma(M) \cap \mathbf{U}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

We denote by $\Omega^0(M)$ the path connected component of $\Omega(M)$ containing M, and call it the *homotopy component* of M in $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$.

The following symplectic matrices were introduced as *basic normal forms* in [41]:

$$D(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \lambda = \pm 2, \tag{6.8}$$

$$N_1(\lambda, b) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & b \\ 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \lambda = \pm 1,\, b = \pm 1,\, 0, \tag{6.9}$$

$$R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \theta \in (0,\pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi), \tag{6.10}$$

$$N_2(\omega, b) = \begin{pmatrix} R(\theta) & b \\ 0 & R(\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \theta \in (0,\pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi), \tag{6.11}$$

where $b = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ b_3 & b_4 \end{pmatrix}$ with $b_i \in \mathbf{R}$ and $b_2 \neq b_3$.

For any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, *splitting number* of M at ω is defined by

$$S_M^{\pm} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} i_{\omega \exp(\pm\sqrt{-1}\epsilon)}(\gamma) - i_\omega(\gamma) \tag{6.12}$$

for any path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ satisfying $\gamma(\tau) = M$.

Splitting numbers possesses the following properties.

Lemma 6.2. (cf. [40], Lemma 9.1.5 and List 9.1.12 of [41]) *Splitting number $S_M^{\pm}(\omega)$ are well defined; that is they are independent of the choice of the path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ satisfying $\gamma(\tau) = M$. For $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ and $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$, $S_N^{\pm}(\omega)$ are constant for all $N \in \Omega^0(M)$. Moreover we have*

(1) $(S_M^+(\pm 1), S_M^-(\pm 1)) = (1,1)$ for $M = \pm N_1(1,b)$ with $b = 1$ or 0;

(2) $(S_M^+(\pm 1), S_M^-(\pm 1)) = (0,0)$ for $M = \pm N_1(1,b)$ with $b = -1$;

(3) $(S_M^+(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}), S_M^-(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta})) = (0,1)$ for $M = R(\theta)$ with $\theta \in (0,\pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi)$;

(4) $(S_M^+(\omega), S_M^-(\omega)) = (0,0)$ for $\omega \in \mathbf{U} \setminus \mathbf{R}$ and $M = N_2(\omega, b)$ is ***trivial*** *i.e., for sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$, $MR((t-1)\alpha)^{\diamond n}$ possesses no eigenvalues on $\mathbf{U}$ for $t \in [0,1)$.*

(5) $(S_M^+(\omega), S_M^-(\omega) = (1,1)$ for $\omega \in \mathbf{U} \setminus \mathbf{R}$ and $M = N_2(\omega, b)$ is ***non-trivial****.*

(6) $(S_M^+(\omega), S_M^-(\omega) = (0,0)$ for any $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ and $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\sigma(M) \cap \mathbf{U} = \emptyset$.

(7) $S_{M_1 \diamond M_2}^{\pm}(\omega) = S_{M_1}^{\pm}(\omega) + S_{M_2}^{\pm}(\omega)$, for any $M_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n_j)$ with $j = 1,2$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$.

By the definition of splitting numbers and Lemma 6.2, for $0 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 < 2\pi$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ with $\tau > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\exp(\sqrt{-1}\theta_2)}(\gamma) &= i_{\exp(\sqrt{-1}\theta_1)} + S_{\gamma(\tau)}^+(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta_1}) \\ &+ \sum_{\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)} \left(S_{\gamma(\tau)}^+(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}) - S_{\gamma(\tau)}^-(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}) \right) - S_{\gamma(\tau)}^-(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta_2}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

For any symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we define its mth iteration in the periodic boundary sense $\gamma(m) : [0, m\tau] \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ by

$$\gamma(m)(t) = \gamma(t - j\tau)\gamma(\tau)^j \qquad \text{for}\, j\tau \leq t \leq (j+1)\tau,\ j = 0, 1, ..., m-1. \tag{6.14}$$

Definition 6.2.(cf.[40], [41]) For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, we define

$$(i_\omega(\gamma, m), \nu_\omega(\gamma, m)) = (i_\omega(\gamma(m)), \nu_\omega(\gamma(m))), \qquad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{6.15}$$

We have the following Bott-type iteration formula.

Theorem 6.1. (cf. [40], Theorem 9.2.1 of [41]) *For any $\tau > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, $z \in \mathbf{U}$, and $m \in \mathbf{N}$,*

$$i_z(\gamma, m) = \sum_{\omega^k = z} i_\omega(\gamma), \qquad \nu_z(\gamma, m) = \sum_{\omega^m = z} \nu_\omega(\gamma). \tag{6.16}$$

By Theorem 8.1.4 of [41], we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2)$ with $\tau > 0$, the following results hold.*

1. *If $N_1(1,1) \in \Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$, then*

$$i_1(\gamma, m) = m(i_1(\gamma) + 1) - 1, \qquad \nu_1(\gamma, m) = 1, \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{6.17}$$

$$i_1(\gamma) \in 2\mathbf{Z} + 1. \tag{6.18}$$

2. *If $N_1(1,1) \in \Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$, then*

$$i_1(\gamma, m) = m(i_1(\gamma) + 1) - 1, \qquad \nu_1(\gamma, m) = 2, \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{6.19}$$

$$i_1(\gamma) \in 2\mathbf{Z} + 1. \tag{6.20}$$

3. *If $N_1(1,-1) \in \Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$, then*

$$i_1(\gamma, m) = m(i_1(\gamma), \qquad \nu_1(\gamma, m) = 1, \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{6.21}$$

$$i_1(\gamma) \in 2\mathbf{Z}. \tag{6.22}$$

Denote by $\mathbf{U}^+ = \{\omega \in \mathbf{U} | Im\,\omega \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbf{U}^- = \{\omega \in \mathbf{U} | Im\,\omega \leq 0\}$. The following theorem was proved by Liu and Long in [33, 34], which plays a important role in the proof of our main results in Sections 4-5.

Theorem 6.2. (Theorem 10.1.1 of [41])

1. *For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $\omega \in \mathbf{U} \setminus \{1\}$, it always holds that*

$$i_1(\gamma) + \nu_1(\gamma) - n \leq i_\omega(\gamma) \leq i_1(\gamma) + n - \nu_\omega(\gamma). \tag{6.23}$$

2. *The left equality in (6.23) holds for some $\omega \in \mathbf{U}^+ \setminus \{1\}$ (or $\mathbf{U}^- \setminus \{1\}$) if and only if $I_{2p} \diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond q} \diamond K \in \Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ for some non-negative integers p and q satisfying $0 \leq p + q \leq n$ and $K \in \mathrm{Sp}(2(n-p-q))$ with $\sigma(K) \in \mathbf{U} \setminus \{1\}$ satisfying the condition that all eigenvalues of K located*

with the arc between 1 *and* ω *including* $\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\{1\}$ *(or* $\mathbf{U}^-\setminus\{1\}$*)possess total multiplicity* $n-p-q$*. If* $\omega\neq -1$*, all eigenvalues of* K *are in* $\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *and those in* $\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *(or* $\mathbf{U}^-\setminus\mathbf{R}$*) are all Krein-negative (or Krein-positive) definite. If* $\omega=-1$*, it holds that* $(-I_{2s})\diamond N_1(-1,1)^{\diamond t}\diamond H\in\Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ *for some non-negative integers* s *and* t *satisfying* $0\le s+t\le n-p-q$*, and some* $H\in\mathrm{Sp}(2(n-p-q-s-t))$ *satisfying* $\sigma(H)\subset\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *and that all elements in* $\sigma(H)\cap\mathbf{U}^+$ *(or* $\sigma(H)\cap\mathbf{U}^-$*) are all Krein-negative (or Krein-positive) definite.*

3. The left equality of (6.23) holds for all $\omega\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\{1\}$ *if and only if* $I_{2p}\diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond(n-p)}\in\Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ *for some integer* $p\in[0,n]$*. Especially in this case, all the eigenvalues of* $\gamma(\tau)$ *are equal to* 1 *and* $\nu_\gamma=n+p\ge n$*.*

4. The right equality in (6.23) holds for some $\omega\in\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\{1\}$ *(or* $\mathbf{U}^-\setminus\{1\}$*) if and only if* $I_{2p}\diamond N_1(1,1)^{\diamond r}\diamond K\in\Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ *for some non-negative integers* p *and* r *satisfying* $0\le p+r\le n$ *and* $K\in\mathrm{Sp}(2(n-p-r))$ *with* $\sigma(K)\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\{1\}$ *satisfying the condition that all eigenvalues of* K *located with the arc between* 1 *and* ω *including* $\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\{1\}$ *(or* $\mathbf{U}^-\setminus\{1\}$*)possess total multiplicity* $n-p-r$*. If* $\omega\neq-1$*, all eigenvalues of* K *are in* $\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *and those in* $\mathbf{U}^+\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *(or* $\mathbf{U}^-\setminus\mathbf{R}$*) are all Krein-positive (or Krein-negative) definite. If* $\omega=-1$*, it holds that* $(-I_{2s})\diamond N_1(-1,1)^{\diamond t}\diamond H\in\Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ *for some non-negative integers* s *and* t *satisfying* $0\le s+t\le n-p-r$*, and some* $H\in\mathrm{Sp}(2(n-p-q-r-t))$ *satisfying* $\sigma(H)\subset\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ *and that all elements in* $\sigma(H)\cap\mathbf{U}^+$ *(or* $\sigma(H)\cap\mathbf{U}^-$*) are all Krein-positive (or Krein-negative) definite.*

5. The right equality of (6.23) holds for all $\omega\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\{1\}$ *if and only if* $I_{2p}\diamond N_1(1,1)^{\diamond(n-p)}\in\Omega^0(\gamma(\tau))$ *for some integer* $p\in[0,n]$*. Especially in this case, all the eigenvalues of* $\gamma(\tau)$ *are equal to* 1 *and* $\nu_\gamma=n+p\ge n$*.*

6. Both equalities of (6.23) holds for all $\omega\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\{1\}$ *if and only if* $\gamma(\tau)=I_{2n}$*.*

Acknowledgements Part of the work was finished during the author's visit at University of Michgan, he sincerely thanks Professor Yongbin Ruan for his invitation and the Department of Mathematics of University of Michigan for its hospitality.

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, V. Benci, Y. Long, A note on the existence of multiple brake orbits. *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.*, 21 (1993) 643-649.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and V. Coti Zelati, Solutions with minimal period for Hamiltonian systems in a potential well. *Ann. I. H. P. Anal. non linéaire* 4 (1987), 242-275.

[3] A. Ambrosetti and G. Mancini, Solutions of minimal period for a class of convex Hamiltonian systems. *Math. Ann.* 255 (1981), 405-421.

[4] T. An and Y. Long, Index theories of second order Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinear Anal.* 27(1998), 585-592.

[5] V. Benci, Closed geodesics for the Jacobi metric and periodic solutions of prescribed energy of natural Hamiltonian systems. *Ann. I. H. P. Analyse Nonl.* 1 (1984) 401-412.

[6] V. Benci, F. Giannoni, A new proof of the existence of a brake orbit. In "Advanced Topics in the Theory of Dynamical Systems". *Notes Rep. Math. Sci. Eng.* 6 (1989) 37-49.

[7] S. Bolotin, Libration motions of natural dynamical systems. *Vestnik Moskov Univ. Ser. I. Mat. Mekh.* 6 (1978) 72-77 (in Russian).

[8] S. Bolotin, V.V. Kozlov, Librations with many degrees of freedom. *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 42 (1978) 245-250 (in Russian).

[9] B. Booss and K. Furutani, The Maslov-type index - a functional analytical definition and the spectral flow formula. *Tokyo J. Math.* 21 (1998), 1-34.

[10] B. Booss and C. Zhu, General spectral flow formula for fixed maximal domain. *Central Eur. J. Math.* 3(3) (2005), 558-577.

[11] S. E. Cappell, R. Lee, and E. Y. Miller, On the Maslov-type index. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 47 (1994) 121-186.

[12] C. Conley and E. Zehnder, Maslov-type index theory for flows and periodix solutions for Hamiltonian equations. *Commu. Pure. Appl. Math.* 37 (1984), 207-253.

[13] D. Dong and Y. Long, The Iteration Theory of the Maslov-type Index Theory with Applications to Nonlinear Hamiltonian Systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 349 (1997), 2619-2661.

[14] J. J. Duistermaat, Fourier Integral Operators, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996.

[15] I. Ekeland, Convexity Methods in Hamiltonian Mechanics. Spring-Verlag. Berlin, 1990.

[16] I. Ekeland and E. Hofer, Periodic solutions with percribed period for convex autonomous Hamiltonian systems. *Invent. Math.* 81 (1985), 155-188.

[17] G. Fei and Q. Qiu, Minimal period solutions of nonlinear Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinear Anal.* 27 (1996), 821-839.

[18] G. Fei, S.-K. Kim, and T. Wang, Minimal Period Estimates of Period Solutions for Superquadratic Hamiltonian Syetems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 238 (1999), 216-233.

[19] G. Fei, S.-K. Kim, and T. Wang, Solutions of minimal period for even classical Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinear Anal.* 43 (2001), 363-375.

[20] M. Girardi and M. Matzeu, Some results on solutions of minimal period to superquadratic Hamiltonian equations, *Nonlinear Anal.* 7 (1983), 475-482.

[21] M. M. Girardi and M. Matzeu, Solutions of minimal period for a class of nonconvex Hamiltonian systems and applications to the fixed energy problem. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA.* 10 (1986), 371-382.

[22] M. Girardi and M. Matzeu, Periodic solutions of convex Hamiltonian systems with a quadratic growth at the origin and superquadratic at infinity. *Ann. Math. Pura ed App.* 147 (1987), 21-72.

[23] M. Girardi and M. Matzeu, Dual Morse index estimates for periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems in some nonconvex superquadratic case. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA.* 17 (1991),481-497.

[24] N. Ghuussoub, Location, multiplicity and Morse indices of min-max critical points. *J. reine angew. Math.* 417 (1991), 27-76.

[25] H. Gluck, W. Ziller, Existence of periodic solutions of conservtive systems. *Seminar on Minimal Submanifolds,* Princeton University Press(1983), 65-98.

[26] E. W. C. van Groesen, Analytical mini-max methods for Hamiltonian brake orbits of prescribed energy. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 132 (1988), 1-12.

[27] K. Hayashi, Periodic solution of classical Hamiltonian systems. *Tokyo J. Math.* 6(1983), 473-486.

[28] A. Lazer and S. Solomini, Nontrivial solution of operator equations and Morse indices of critical points of min-max type. *Nonlinear anal.* 12 (1988), 761-775.

[29] C. Liu, A note on the monotonicity of Maslov-type index of Linear Hamiltonian systems with applications. Proceedings of the royal Society of Edinburg 135A (2005), 1263-1277.

[30] . C. Liu, Maslov-type index theory for symplectic paths with Lagrangian boundary conditions. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* 7 no.1 (2007), 131-161.

[31] C. Liu, Asymptotically Linear Hamiltonian Systems With Largrangian Boundary Conditions. *Pacific J. Math.* vol. 232 no.1 (2007), 233-255.

[32] C. Liu, Minimal period estimates for brake orbits of nonlinear symmetric Hamiltonian systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* Vol.27 no.1 (2010), 337-355.

[33] C. Liu and Y. Long, An optimal increasing estimate for iterated Maslov-type indices. *Chinese Sci. Bull.* 42 (1997), 2275-2277.

[34] C. Liu and Y. Long, Iteration inequalities of the Maslov-type index theory with applications. *J. Diff. Equa.* 165 (2000), 355-376.

[35] C. Liu and D. Zhang, An iteration theory of Maslov-type index for symplectic paths associated with a Lagranfian subspace and Multiplicity of brake orbits in bounded convex symmetric domains, arXiv: 0908.0021vl [math. SG].

[36] Y. Long, Maslov-type index, degenerate critical points, and asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems. *Science in China*, Series A. 7 (1990), 673-682 (Chinese edition), 33 (1990), 1409-1419.(English edition)

[37] Y. Long, The minimal period problem of classical Hamiltonian systems with even potentials. *Ann. I. H. P. Anal. non linéaire*, 10-6 (1993), 605-626.

[38] Y. Long, The minimal period problem of period solutions for autonomous superquadratic second Hamiltonian systems. *J. Diff. Equa.* 111 (1994), 147-174.

[39] Y. Long, On the minimal period for periodic solution problem of nonlinear Hamiltonian systems. *Chinese Ann. of math.* 18B (1997) 481-484.

[40] Y. Long, Bott formula of the Maslov-type index theory. *Pacific J. Math.* 187 (1999), 113-149.

[41] Y. long, Index Theory for symplectic Paths with applications. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2002.

[42] Y. Long, D. Zhang, C. Zhu, Multiple brake orbits in bounded convex symmetric domains. *Advances in Math.* 203 (2006) 568-635.

[43] P.H. Rabinowitz, Periodic solution of Hamiltonian systems. *Commu. Pure Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), 157-184.

[44] P.H. Rabinowitz, Minimax Methods in Critical Point Theory with Applications to Differential Equations. *CBMS Regional Conf. Ser. in Math.*, No. 65, A.M.S., Providence (1986)

[45] P. H. Rabinowitz, On the existence of periodic solutions for a class of symmetric Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.* 11 (1987) 599-611.

[46] J. Robbin and D. Salamon, The Maslov indices for paths. *Topology* 32 (1993), 827-844.

[47] H. Seifert, Periodische Bewegungen mechanischer Systeme. *Math. Z.* 51 (1948), 197-216.

[48] S. Solimini, Morse indes estimates in min-max theorems. *manuscription math.* 63 (1989), 421-453.

[49] A. Szulkin, Cohomology and Morse theory for strongly indefinite functions. *Math. Z.* 209 (1992), 375-418.

[50] Y. Xiao, Periodic Solutions with Prescribed Minimal Period for Second Order Hamiltonian Systems with Even Potentials.*Acta Math. Sinica, English Series* No.5 Vol. 26 (2010), 825-830.

[51] D. Zhang, Symmetric Period Solutions With Prescribed Period For Even Autonomous Semi-positive Hamiltonian Systems. *preprint*

[52] D. Zhang, Maslov-type index and brake orbits in nonlinear Hamiltonian systems. *Science in China* No. 6 vol. 50 (2007), 761-772.

[53] C. Zhu and Y. Long, Maslov index theory for symplectic paths and spectral flow(I), *Chinese Ann. of Math.* 208 (1999) 413-424.